LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BR
45
.B35
1890

THE

BAMPTON LECTURES

1890

PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
LONDON

MODERN CRITICISM

CONSIDERED IN ITS RELATION TO THE

FOURTH GOSPEL

BEING THE BAMPTON LECTURES FOR 1890

BY

HENRY WILLIAM WATKINS, M.A., D.D.

SOMETIME SCHOLAR OF BALLIOL COLLEGE, OXFORD; FELLOW OF KING'S
COLLEGE, LONDON; ARCHDEACON AND CANON OF DURHAM, AND
PROFESSOR OF HEBREW IN THE UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM

LONDON
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET
1890

All rights reserved

EXTRACT

FROM THE LAST WILL AND TESTAMENT

OF THE LATE

REV. JOHN BAMPTON,

CANON OF SALISBURY.

——'I give and bequeath my Lands and Estates to the Chancellor, Masters, and Scholars of the University of Oxford for ever, to have and to hold all and singular the said Lands or Estates upon trust, and to the intents and purposes hereinafter mentioned; that is to say, I will and appoint, that the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford for the time being shall take and receive all the rents, issues, and profits thereof, and (after all taxes, reparations, and necessary deductions made) that he pay all the remainder to the endowment of eight Divinity Lecture Sermons, to be established for ever in the said University, and to be performed in the manner following:

'I direct and appoint, that, upon the first Tuesday in Easter Term, a Lecturer be yearly chosen by the Heads of Colleges only, and by no others, in the room adjoining to the Printing-House, between the hours of ten in the morning and two in the afternoon, to preach eight Divinity Lecture Sermons, the year following, at St. Mary's in Oxford, between the commencement of the last month in Lent Term, and the end of the third week in Act Term.

'Also I direct and appoint, that the eight Divinity Lecture Sermons shall be preached upon either of the following Subjects—to confirm and establish the Christian Faith, and to confute all heretics and schismatics—upon the divine authority of the Holy Scriptures—upon the authority of the writings of the primitive Fathers as to the faith and practice of the primitive Church—upon the Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ—upon the Divinity of the Holy Ghost—upon the Articles of the Christian Faith, as comprehended in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds.

'Also I direct, that thirty copies of the eight Divinity Lecture Sermons shall be always printed, within two months after they are preached, and one copy shall be given to the Chancellor of the University, and one copy to the Head of every College, and one copy to the Mayor of the City of Oxford, and one copy to be put into the Bodleian Library; and the expence of printing them shall be paid out of the revenue of the Lands or Estates given for establishing the Divinity Lecture Sermons; and the Preacher shall not be paid, nor be entitled to the revenue, before they are printed.

'Also I direct and appoint, that no person shall be qualified to preach the Divinity Lecture Sermons, unless he hath taken the Degree of Master of Arts at least, in one of the two Universities of Oxford or Cambridge; and that the same person shall never preach the Divinity Lecture Sermons twice.'

PREFATORY NOTE.

To the Revd. the Vice-Chancellor of the
University of Oxford.

Dear Mr. Vice-Chancellor,

One of the duties which is imposed upon a Bampton Lecturer by the 'Last Will and Testament' of the Founder is to print the 'eight Divinity Lecture Sermons' 'within two months after they are preached,' and to present copies to certain official persons.

You will, I hope, permit me, while I have the pleasure of asking your acceptance of this copy of the lectures for 1890, the last of which was delivered yesterday, to accompany it with some brief prefatory remarks which may help the reader, in so far as he may care to do so, to approach these lectures from the point of view of the writer.

The story of the genesis of this book is simple:—

One day while walking with the late Bishop of Durham, when we hoped he was regaining strength, I took the opportunity of asking him how he accounted for the fact of the frequent assertion that the genuineness of the Fourth Gospel was disproved by modern criticism, in the presence of the strong and accumulating evidence in its favour. Those who have endeavoured to extract an opinion from that great Bishop and scholar during an afternoon's walk, will not be surprised to hear that at the end of our stroll my question was not answered, but that I had been asked several others in the meantime, and that the suggestion was made that the subject might be profitably treated in a course of Bampton Lectures.

The conversation recurred to my mind in a wakeful night, and I drew out a rough outline of the arguments which presented themselves. This I forwarded to the Bishop, who wrote the following note in reply :—

> I have read your scheme, and entirely approve of it. No subject could be more useful at the present day, and I think that the time has arrived when it can be effectively treated. Of course it will take much time, but it will be worth the expenditure.
>
> J. B. Dunelm.

He was also kind enough, I believe, to express his opinion to more than one of the Heads of Colleges, and it was probably in consequence of that opinion that I was appointed to deliver the lectures of 1890.

The 'much time' which the Bishop saw would be needed for, and which he wished that I should give to the subject, has been largely filled by events which, if they had been foreseen, must have prevented my undertaking the duty that has now been ended rather than fulfilled. The Bishop's own illness and death brought necessarily a large increase of public and private obligations; and these brought in their train a protracted inability for the vigorous performance of any duty. At the beginning of this year the time seemed to have come when I could hardly hope to be sufficiently well, or sufficiently free from pressing engagements, either to prepare the lectures or to deliver them. One of my oldest and kindest friends wrote :—

> It is impossible that he can do justice to himself, or what he will think of far greater importance, justice to his subject; it would be in every way better that he should seek release from a duty which he cannot perform.

I felt bound by no ordinary obligation to yourself and the other Heads of Colleges whose kindness had entrusted me with so great a responsibility, but I think that in my prostration I might have followed my friend's advice, had not my eye fallen upon the last words which my Bishop had written to me just before his death. They seemed now to come from another world as a command which must be obeyed, and for which strength would be supplied.

The lectures will, I hope, need little explanation to any thoughtful reader; but as their purpose has been somewhat mistaken, you will perhaps allow me to point out:—

(1) That they are a course of eight lectures. No one lecture aims therefore at any completeness in itself, but forms only a single step of the stairs. And the whole is a course of eight Lecture Sermons, with obvious limitations of time and place, and not an independent work, and cannot therefore aim at full treatment of so wide a subject. The eight steps can at most form a staircase, and are not a furnished house.

(2) That the subject is not the Fourth Gospel, nor yet the evidences, external or internal, in favour of its authenticity or genuineness, but 'Modern criticism considered in its relation to the Fourth Gospel.' The evidences are abundantly discussed elsewhere. My purpose is to estimate the criticism which this century has produced in our own and other countries. I believed before commencing these investigations, and believe now, with a confidence which does not fall short of certainty, that there is no foundation for the asser-

tions which are so often made and accepted, to the effect that modern criticism is fatal to the claims of the Fourth Gospel; and I have tried to show this.

(3) That the examination which I have endeavoured to make has relation to the Fourth Gospel, and to the Fourth Gospel only. It cannot in fairness be fully extended to any other book of the New Testament, and still less to any book of the Old Testament. The evidence in relation to any given book in one of these libraries must be examined separately. The case of the Fourth Gospel is, however, admittedly the one in which there has been the greatest array of hostile critics and the loudest assertions of victory. If these critics are disarmed and the victory is shown to be on the other side, we may well doubt whether a similar array of hostile criticism and similar shouts of victory are not in the same way to be distrusted in analogous cases. But the argument from analogy must not be unduly pressed. The wise man will use it with caution, but he will nevertheless use it.

(4) That in these lectures no reference has been intentionally made to any work which is not named in them. I am of course not unaware that considerable discussion has arisen in Oxford with regard to more than one recent utterance which has been made there. But from the day of my appointment as lecturer, I have thought it my duty to abstain from reading or hearing any such utterance. It seemed to me to be right to speak of my own subject without introducing any tinge of feeling which might seem to come from possibility of personal reference to any member of the University before which these lectures were to be delivered.

Perhaps some few words should be added as to the method which has been followed. To examine evidence required the production of witnesses, and the number of witnesses has rendered the treatment much more technical than I could have wished. I have allowed every witness, as far as possible, to speak for himself, and have supported his evidence by reference to its original sources.

It will appear to every reader that I have for this purpose made full use of the many guides to this knowledge which are now within reach. To the scholar it will, I hope, appear also that these guides have been used only as roads to the quarries. Considerable pains have been taken to make the references really useful to the student. They will be often found to differ from those in other works which cover common ground and to which I am frequently indebted. It is too much to hope that they will not sometimes be found to be wrong, for there is many a slip between the page of the author who is quoted, and the printed page of the writer who quotes ; but it should not be concluded that they are wrong, *because* they differ from those in other works :—

> Illi in nos sæviant, qui nesciunt cum quo labore verum inveniatur, et quàm difficilè caveantur errores.

It will be specially evident that I have made constant reference to German authorities, and while I have had occasion to dissent from the position which has been assigned to some of them by certain English writers, I should be indeed ungrateful if I did not feel that the investigations of German scholars—investigations perhaps rather than results—have placed all workers in this field under an obligation which cannot be too fully acknowledged.

On more than one occasion in the lectures I have had to apologize for a too cursory treatment of an important point, and I feel on reviewing them as a whole, that there are few pages which do not offer a peg on which an *excursus* may well be hung. I had intended to make at least some such additions, but to do so with any approach to completeness would add a second volume as bulky as the present one. This would make it, moreover, impossible for me to fulfil the Founder's condition as to printing the lectures, and impossible to keep the price of the book within moderate limits. Perhaps there is now as much of technical detail as 'eight Divinity Lecture Sermons' can fairly bear.

If anyone who heard the lectures should do me the honour of reading them, he will find that several passages in each lecture were omitted in delivery, and that some were condensed. As it was, I fear that I trespassed somewhat unduly on the kindness and attention of my hearers. I have also changed a word or two in a few passages; but I have not ventured to make any important change or to alter the 'Lecture Sermon' form of the whole. It seems to have been the intention of the Founder that this form should be preserved, and that the lectures should be printed as they were delivered before the University.

It remains for me to add that these lectures owe much to the fact that more than one kind friend has looked at them as they have passed through the press. If I do not publicly thank these friends by name, it is because they ought not to be made in any way responsible for much with which they would possibly not agree. The name of one dear friend, Bishop Lightfoot, has been mentioned in connexion with them:—

Multis ille bonis flebilis occidit.

What I owe to him is more than I can tell or can myself know, and it would be my greatest happiness to think that any trace of this debt were to be found in these lectures which came from his suggestion; but it is due to his memory and to my readers, to make prominent the fact that no word of them was known to him. The general plan has his *imprimatur*, but this cannot be extended to any part of the execution. I cannot doubt that this execution would have fallen far below his idea; for I know that it has fallen far below my own. Of some passages he would certainly have disapproved, and were he still with us they could not have been spoken. Of these the reader will as certainly approve; for no estimate could rightly be made of the criticism of the Fourth Gospel in this century, without frequent reference to the most competent witness that the century has produced.

There is one who is more than a friend, whose hand never tired when I was able only to dictate, and without whose constant help these lectures could not have been written and could not have been printed.

To yourself, Sir, and the other Heads of Houses, my thanks are due, not only for the honour conferred upon me by your appointment, but for much generous courtesy which has been freely extended to me.

I have the honour to remain,

dear Mr. Vice-Chancellor,

Your faithful and obliged servant,

H. W. WATKINS.

ATHENÆUM CLUB:
June 9, 1890.

⁂ The Lectures were delivered on the following dates in conformity with University arrangements:

In Lent Term: Lectures I.–III., March 2, 9, 16.

In Easter Term: Lectures IV.–VII., April 27, May 4, 11, 18.

In Trinity Term: Lecture VIII., June 8.

CONTENTS.

LECTURE I.

For we can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth.
2 Cor. xiii. 8.

PAGE

I. INTRODUCTION.

A. The Subject stated: Modern criticism and the Fourth Gospel 3

B. Divisions of the Subject: The 'judgment of centuries.' 'Our age.' Width of inquiry 4

C. Tone of discussion: Anti-theological prejudice. Renan. Mental achromatism. This achromatism impossible 6

Illustrations:—

(α) James Mackintosh
(β) David Hume
(γ) *The Adventurer*
(δ) 'Cowardly Agnosticism'
(ε) Mark Pattison
(ζ) *Fortnightly Review*
(η) Pope 10

D. Friendly and adverse witness: Dean Stanley. Advocate or judge? Position of a Bampton Lecturer . 13

PAGE

II. EVIDENCE OF THE SECOND CENTURY: *The Third Generation*:—

A. Church of Lyons:

Irenæus: His date, and work against Gnosticism. His use of the Fourth Gospel 18

B. Church of Alexandria:

Clement: His origin, date, teachers, and pupils. His frequent use of the Fourth Gospel. John and the 'spiritual Gospel' 20

C. Churches of Rome and Carthage:

Tertullian: His position as a writer, date, and training. His frequent quotations from the Fourth Gospel. Passages from his works:—

(α) Rule against heretics
(β) The Apostolic churches
(γ) Authors of 'Evangelical Instrument'
(δ) Apostles handed down that which was from the beginning
(ε) The Evangelist and beloved disciple . . 22

D. Church of Antioch:

Theophilus: His writings testified to by Jerome and Eusebius. His *Commentary on the Gospels* doubtful. Importance of the treatise *To Autolycus*. Its undoubted reference to the Fourth Gospel, which is included among 'Holy Scriptures,' and the author among 'spirit-bearing men' . . 27

E. Churches of Asia Minor:

Melito: Witness from Sardis. The probable date of his writings. List given by Eusebius. Other lists. His full testimony to the Fourth Gospel . 33

Apolinaris: Witness from Hierapolis. List of his works given by:

(α) Eusebius
(β) Theodoret
(γ) Photius

His reference to the Fourth Gospel . . . 36

PAGE

Testimony to the writings of Melito and Apolinaris given by:
  (α) Polycrates
  (β) Hippolytus
  (γ) Tertullian (quoted by Jerome)
  (δ) Clement of Alexandria
  (ε) Anastatius of Sinai
  (ζ) Serapion, and other bishops
  (η) Jerome
  (θ) Socrates 37

Polycrates: Witness from Ephesus. His testimony to the Fourth Gospel in a letter addressed to Victor of Rome. His own account of his position 41

F. The Old Latin and Peshito Versions, and the Muratorian Fragment:

Liddon's approval of Westcott's opinion on:
  (α) The Old Latin
  (β) The Peshito
  (γ) The Muratorian Fragment 42

Force of the evidence if their early date is established

Recent opinions:
  (α) Bishop Lightfoot
  (β) Von Döllinger

Result independent of these opinions . . . 44

Summary: Strength of testimony. Its extent and unanimity in the third generation of the Second Century. The corporate life of the Church. Answer of the author of *Supernatural Religion* is no answer. Conclusion 46

LECTURE II.

Remember the days of old,
Consider the years of many generations;
Ask thy father, and he will show thee;
Thine elders, and they will tell thee.
Deut. xxxii. 7.

PAGE

I. EVIDENCE OF THE SECOND CENTURY: *The Second Generation*:—

A. Justin Martyr: His conversion. His estimate of the ethics of opinion. His writings. Chronology not accurately known 53

Opinions of:
(α) Credner
(β) Volkmar
(γ) Hort 57

Date of the First *Apology* and *Dialogue*: Their evidence to the use of the Fourth Gospel. Nature of an apology. The *Dialogue* an apology addressed to the Jews. Position of an apologist in the Second Century illustrated by later apologists . 58

Examples:
(α) Tatian
(β) Athenagoras
(γ) Tertullian
(δ) Cyprian 63

Direct reference in Justin to the Evangelists ought not to be expected. What traces of the Fourth Gospel are actually found 64

Memoirs: Recurrence of term.
Examples:
(α) *The Memoirs*
(β) *Memoirs of the Apostles*
(γ) *Memoirs of His Apostles*
(δ) *His Memoirs*

Memoirs further described 65

PAGE

Memoirs considered as,
  (*a*) a written record of the Lord
  (*β*) sacred books
  (*γ*) of Apostolic authority
  (*δ*) coming from the Lord Himself . . . 67

Use by Tertullian, Irenæus, and other contemporaries and followers. Identity therefore of the *Memoirs* with the *Four Gospels.* This proved by Tatian's *Diatessaron*, the key to Justin's *Memoirs.* The identification is made by Justin, and known to Irenæus and others. The Fourth Gospel certainly included in the *Memoirs* 68

Results of recent investigations of this question by:
  (*a*) Thoma
  (*β*) Hilgenfeld
  (*γ*) Ezra Abbot
  (*δ*) James Drummond
  (*ε*) Sanday
  (*ζ*) Westcott

Consensus of opinion 73

Why did not Justin quote more fully from the Fourth Gospel? Reasons suggested. Existing works only fragments 81

B. The Clementines: Now certain that the Fourth Gospel is quoted in the *Homilies.* Their probable date. Importance of their evidence . . . 83

C. Valentinus: His date. His importance as a witness. His followers form two schools:
  (*a*) In the East: the *Excerpta Theodoti* and *Doctrina Orientalis*
  (*β*) In the West: Ptolemæus and Heracleon . 85

Testimony to their works and knowledge of S. John by:
  (*a*) Irenæus
  (*β*) Epiphanius
  (*γ*) Clement
  (*δ*) Origen
  (*ε*) Hippolytus 87

PAGE

The testimony of Valentinus to the Fourth Gospel. The Valentinians a school. The Catholics also a school. Statements by Irenæus and Tertullian. Conclusion as to the use of the Fourth Gospel by the Valentinians 90

D. Marcion : His date. Reason for his rejection of the Fourth Gospel. The testimony of Tertullian and Irenæus shows that he was acquainted with it . . 93

II. Evidence of the Second Century : *The First Generation :—*

A. Polycarp : Date of martyrdom 95

B. Papias : The writings. Testimony of Irenæus to Papias and Polycarp. His *Letter to Florinus.* Testimony of Eusebius to Papias 96

C. Basilides : Probably referred to by Papias. His date, treated more fully in Lecture VII. . . . 100

Summary : Result of the evidence of the Second Century in the third, second, and first generations : That the Fourth Gospel was accepted throughout the Century as the work of John the Apostle and Evangelist . . 102

LECTURE III.

And . . . many . . . believed . . . because of the word of the woman, who testified, . . . And many more believed because of his word ; and they said to the woman, Now we believe, not because of thy speaking : for we have heard for ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Saviour of the world.—John iv. 39, 41, 42.

I. Facts of the Reception. The Evidence of Sixteen Centuries.

Fulness of evidence to the use of the Fourth Gospel in the third and succeeding centuries. Details not needed, but bird's-eye view 107

A. Evidence of the Third Century :

The Muratorian Fragment. The Versions . . 108

PAGE

Eastern Church:
  Origen: His division of the sacred writings
  Dionysius: His opinion on the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse opposed to that of modern negative criticism
  The *Apostolical Constitutions* 109

Western Church:
  Evidence of:
    (α) Caius
    (β) Hippolytus
    (γ) Cyprian 111

B. Evidence of the Fourth and succeeding Centuries:
  In the East:
    (α) Eusebius
    (β) Cyril of Jerusalem
    (γ) Athanasius
    (δ) Didymus
    (ε) Gregory of Nazianzus
    (ζ) Amphilochius
    (η) Epiphanius
    (θ) Theodore of Mopsuestia
    (ι) John Chrysostom 112

  Period of the Uncial MSS. Survey of the lists, canons, and councils. Close of Canon in the East. No doubt as to the Fourth Gospel . . . 120

  On the borderland:
    (α) Hilary of Poitiers
    (β) Philaster of Brescia
    (γ) Rufinus of Aquileia 122

  In the West:
    (α) Jerome
    (β) Augustine. Close of Canon in the West . 122

  The Alogi: an apparent exception to universal acceptance of the Fourth Gospel. Name appears first in Epiphanius. They ascribe the Gospel to Cerinthus. Rejection by Zeller. These supposed antagonists are really positive evidence . . 123

PAGE

II. Principles of the Reception.

A. Views now commonly held :
- (α) The authority of the Church
- (β) The inner witness
- (γ) Verbal inspiration
- (δ) Canons of historical and literary criticism . 127

B. Treatment of the question in the Apostolic age :
Idea of writing excluded. Oral tradition and writings side by side. Reasons why the early Church did not provide a Canon of Scripture. New Testament writings not regarded as 'Scripture.' Examples 140

C. The question in the post-Apostolic age :
Gospels not quoted as Canonical. Johannine influence. Growth of reference to the words of our Lord Jesus Christ. Constant appeal to the 'Word of the Lord.' Examples. Individual churches and writings 142

The idea of a Catholic Church not yet realized. Heretics the first to quote the Scriptures. Obligation, therefore, of the Church to draw up a Catholic Canon. The Canon a question of history, not of dogma. Tradition the first formative principle. In the third and fourth centuries, tradition became one with the sacred Scriptures. The Scriptures depend on the Church ; the Church on the Scriptures 146

Testimony of :
- (α) Augustine
- (β) Jerome 149

The Canon accepted on the authority of the Church until the Reformation. Acceptance of the Fourth Gospel in the *Dark Ages* 151

D. Altered view of the Scriptures at the Reformation :

Position of :
- (α) Bodenstein of Carlstadt
- (β) Luther
- (γ) Calvin
- (δ) Zwingli 152

PAGE

The Council of Trent. The infallibility of Scripture substituted for the infallibility of the Church. This infallibility attacked by modern criticism . 155

E. Verbal inspiration a new departure :

Opinions of :
(*a*) Westcott
(β) Bishop of Carlisle
(γ) Newman
(δ) Bishop of Amycla
(ε) Richard Baxter
(ζ) Neander 157

Summary: Result of the 'judgment of centuries.' Comprehension exemplified in width of the induction. Depth of conviction shown by instances :
(*a*) Venerable Bede
(β) Bishop Lightfoot 161

LECTURE IV.

Is there a thing whereof men say, See, this is new? it hath been already in the ages, which were before us.—Eccles. i. 10.

CRITICISM OF 'OUR AGE.'

Assertion cannot be accepted as proof, nor yet originality

Destructive criticism not sufficient. Constructive demanded 169

A. Evanson :

The *Dissonance of the Gospels*. The author. The work, unworthy of the subject 174

Replies by :
(*a*) Priestley
(β) Simpson 176

Survey of German influences at the opening of this century. The Romanticists and others. Bearing of these years on the Gospels 177

PAGE

B. Bretschneider:

Life and earlier works 179

The *Probabilia*. Its purpose and scope. The Johannine discourses largely imaginary. The author not the Apostle, nor a Palestinian, nor a Jew. The Gospel sprung from Jewish anti-Christian zeal, and cannot be supported from the Apocalypse nor from the Epistles. The Epistles themselves are not proved to be Johannine, and they strengthen adverse views about the Gospel. The external evidences not sufficient. Weight of opposing internal evidence. The place probably Egypt. Summary 180

Importance of the book

Bretschneider convinced by replies: His definite and repeated retractation, 'Question is settled'

Bretschneider's character in the *Autobiography* . 187

C. Strauss:

Home life. Blaubeuren. Tübingen. Berlin. Tutor at Tübingen. Influence of Schleiermacher. The calm of 1834. The storm of 1835 . . 191

The *Leben Jesu*. The replies. 'Nothing new' in the *Leben Jesu*

Strauss's critical methods. The 'mythical theory.' Later investigations of myths 194

Position of:

(*a*) Bunsen

(β) Ullmann

(γ) Baur 196

The *Leben Jesu* contained no critique of the Gospels

Strauss's incredible uncertainty about John, described by Baur . . . . . .

Strauss's life between the third and fourth editions of the *Leben Jesu*

Nomination to Zürich

The fourth edition

The *Christliche Glaubenslehre* 197

No theological work produced by Strauss in period 1840-64. Agnes Schebest. Strauss in parliament 201

PAGE

The new *Leben Jesu*, 1864. Its scope. Written for the laity. 'Theologians are the least impartial.' Renan. Earlier *Lives* of Jesus. Critique of the Gospels. The 'Theologian' clings to the Fourth Gospel 202

The external evidence :
  (α) Its weakness
  (β) Papias
  (γ) The Fourth Gospel itself
  (δ) Second Epistle of Peter
  (ε) Ignatius
  (ζ) Justin Martyr
  (η) The *Philosophumena* 206

The internal evidence :
  (α) The Valentinians
  (β) The Montanists
  (γ) The Clementines
  (δ) Apolinaris
  (ε) The Apologists
  (ζ) Theophilus
  (η) Irenæus 209

The Alogi : Their tactical mistake in rejecting the Apocalypse. Summary 211

Strauss returns later to the Johannine question. His critique is really that of the Tübingen School. The older work will not fit on this new critique. Conscious and unconscious fiction. Strauss and Baur. Re-writing of the theory of myth. Bruno Bauer. Volkmar. Earlier and later theories of myth 212

Strauss's disappointment
His view of
  (α) Ewald
  (β) Baur

The 'mythical theory' dead. Myth cannot live with Design. Renan's theory of legend . . 217

Summary : Strauss makes no substantial addition to the criticism of the Fourth Gospel 219

LECTURE V.

And not even so did their witness agree together.—Mark xiv. 59.

I. THE NEW TÜBINGEN SCHOOL:

A. Baur:

PAGE
Evangelical sympathies Influenced by Schleiermacher and Hegel 223
Work at Blaubeuren and Tübingen
Extent of his literary work. List of books and shorter writings 225
Baur's method of investigation. Pauline and Petrine parties. Four Pauline Epistles . . 228
At first took no part in the 'Johannine question,' but was afterwards convinced that it was a 'tendency-writing.' Application of the principle to the 'mythical theory' 230
Combination of results:
Three stages:—
(α) To A.D. 70: The documents
(β) A.D. 70 to 140: ,, ,,
(γ) From A.D. 140: ,, ,,
The Johannine Gospel 232

B. Followers of Baur:

Schwegler
Ritschl
Hilgenfeld
Köstlin
Volkmar
Holsten
Zeller 234
Baur bound by the Hegelian *Left*. Development of philosophy 237
Baur's theory an arch. The arch tested. The foundations doubted 238

PAGE

The workmen questioned :
  (α) Volkmar
  (β) Hilgenfeld
  (γ) Ritschl
  (δ) Holsten
The arch a ruin 240

French writers :
  Stap
  D'Eichthal 244

German criticism of the Tübingen school :
  (α) De Wette
  (β) Meyer 245

II. THE PARTITION THEORIES :

  Eckermann
  Ammon
  Paulus
  Weisse
  Schenkel
  Schweizer
  Tobler
  Ewald
  Hase
  Reuss
  Renan
  Sabatier
  Weizsäcker
  Wendt 246

III. THE NEGATIVE SCHOOL :

A. German :
  Keim
  Holtzmann, Heinrich
  Hönig
  Thoma
  Mangold
  Holtzmann, Oscar 258

PAGE

B. Dutch :

Scholten 263

C. English :

Tayler

Author of *Supernatural Religion*

Opinions of this work by :

(*a*) Zahn

(*β*) Salmon

Abbott

Davidson 266

Examination of his works :

The First *Introduction.*

Dedication. The newer criticism. The author's position. View of the Fourth Gospel. Conclusion as to its authenticity 272

The Second *Introduction*

Change of view and later opinions on the Fourth Gospel. Similar treatment of the Acts of the Apostles. Criticism on this change by Schürer. Both views cannot be right. His position between the two editions 278

D. The two latest critics :

Martineau

His general position 286

Views on :

(*a*) The unity of composition

(*β*) Author

(*γ*) External evidence

(*δ*) Internal evidence

(*ε*) The Apocalypse

(*ζ*) Paschal controversy

(*η*) The 'Marks of Time

(*θ*) The First Epistle 287

Delff 292

PAGE

Views of these critics on :

(*a*) Eye-witness
(*β*) Unity
(*γ*) Period
(*δ*) Subjective criticism

Compared and found to be diametrically opposed . 293

CONCLUSION 295

LECTURE VI.

At the mouth of two witnesses or three shall every word be established.—2 Cor. xiii. 1.

I. INTRODUCTION :

Schleiermacher :

His position, influence and character. His writings. Free treatment of the New Testament. Special views on the Fourth Gospel. Johannine authorship upheld throughout 299

Neander :

Change of name from Mendel to Neander. Special qualifications. His *Life of Jesus*, and Lectures on S. John 304

De Wette :

Early essays. His character and life. Liberal views. The Johannine question. His *Introduction* and *Commentary* 307

Lücke :

The Berlin group. The *Commentary*. The religious sense. Acquaintance with the newer theories. Result of his criticism 310

Bleek :

Estimate of his powers. Earlier writings. The *Beiträge*. The *Introduction* 313

PAGE

Bunsen :

Arnold's opinion of him. Fourth Gospel a 'cardinal point' 315

Ebrard :

Writings on the subject. Strong views on the Fourth Gospel and on negative criticism 317

Tholuck and Hengstenberg :

Their influence and weight of opinion. *Commentaries on S. John* 318

Meyer :

Wide range of work and time. Review of the negative criticism. Delight in Luther's testimony . 319

Lechler :

His works. Doctrinal forms prove Johannine authorship. Change of view. Intellectualism. Abides by view of S. John 321

Weiss :

His works. Johannine authorship maintained throughout. Summary of his conclusions . . 323

Luthardt :

His works devoted to the Johannine question. Results 326

Godet :

His *Commentary on S. John.* Conviction by impression and by scientific study 328

Beyschlag :

His writings. Result of his examination of Baur's theory 329

Zahn :

His independence. The *History of the Canon.* The Fourth Gospel 330

Franke :

His *Old Testament in John.* Scope of work. Johannine type of doctrine. Form of the writing. The author a Hebrew-speaking Jew of the first century 332

PAGE

Other writers who hold the positive view :
  The value of their testimony 334

Four English names reserved for special treatment :
  Character of the witnesses :
    (*a*) Bishop Lightfoot
    (β) Bishop Westcott
    (γ) Salmon
    (δ) Sanday 337

Their position unnoticed by many Continental critics :
  Examples :
    (*a*) Bleek
    (β) Weiss
    (γ) Meyer 342

Their evidence :
  Bishop Lightfoot's : The school of S. John in the second century 343
  Bishop Westcott's : Internal evidence. External evidence. All evidence points in one direction . . 345
  Salmon's : The Gospel and First Epistle by the same writer. Date. External evidence. Conditions of authorship met only by S. John 346
  Sanday's : Advance of positive evidence. Internal evidence. One key only fits the wards . . . 348

CONCLUSION :
  Personality. Anonymity
  Evidence largely a question of reputation
  Requisites in a witness 350

LECTURE VII.

Therefore every scribe who hath been made a disciple to the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is a householder, which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old.—Matt. xiii. 52.

PAGE

I. DISCOVERIES OF 'OUR AGE.'

Statement of subject. Width of inquiry . . . 357

A. Villemain's search expedition. Discoveries of Mynas. The *Philosophumena* edited by Miller . . . 359

Discussion of the authorship :

Views held by :

(α) Jacobi
(β) Duncker and Schneidewin
(γ) Bunsen
(δ) Lommatzsch
(ε) Von Döllinger
(ζ) Cruice
(η) Baur and Fessler

Consensus of opinion in favour of Hippolytus . . 361

Importance of the discovery

Which is the true Basilides?

Critics generally prefer Hippolytus. Exceptions.

Opinions of :

(α) Hort
(β) Renan

This conclusion independent of any view of the Fourth Gospel 364

But this Basilides contains clear quotations from the Gospel. Meaning of *φησίν*.

Critical opinions of :

(α) Bunsen
(β) Keim
(γ) Renan
(δ) Arnold 368

PAGE

B. The Clementine Homilies :

Dressel's discovery. Quotation now admitted on all sides. Zeller's unfortunate assertion 373

C. Tatian's *Diatessaron* :

The modern discovery
Reference to the work by
(*a*) Eusebius
(β) Epiphanius
Not known in the Western Church 375

Known in the Syrian Church and written in Syriac
Homilies of Aphrahat
Doctrine of Addai
Theodoret
Bar-Salîbî
The Mechitarist Fathers
Mösinger
Ezra Abbot
Wace
Zahn's restoration of the text
Older than the Curetonian Syriac
Result stated by Harnack
Arabic MSS. in the Vatican and in Egypt, edited by Ciasca
Importance of the discovery 380

D. The Martyrdom of Polycarp :

Older view A.D. 167. The key
Usher, Pearson and others
Letronne and Borghesi
Waddington decides for Feb. 23, A.D. 155
General acceptance of this result
Bishop Lightfoot's investigations confirm it
Importance of this date 387

E. The *Heads against Caius* :

Commentary of Bar-Salîbî
Gwynn on Hippolytus and Caius. Both accepted the Fourth Gospel 392

PAGE

F. No discoveries oppose the Johannine authorship
Fragments of Papias do not oppose but support it
Weight of this negative proof 393

II. REINVESTIGATION OF MATERIALS.

A. The Ignatian Epistles:

Bishop Lightfoot convinced on investigation
Zahn's statement of the change. Result
Still fresh materials confirm the view
Harnack's judgment
Date of the Epistles
Johannine quotations about A.D. 110
Other contemporary writings 395

B. Epistle of Polycarp:

Harnack's view
Importance of the Letter
Silence of Eusebius
Syriac version of Eusebius. Cureton. Dindorf. Wright
Armenian version. Merx
Syriac Apology 402

CONCLUSION:

No body of negative criticism which is not self-destructive
The positive is to the negative criticism as $\frac{1}{0} = \infty$
Suggestions of author other than S. John, valueless
The river of the past strengthened in the present . 409

LECTURE VIII.

Many other signs therefore did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book; but these are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in his name.—John xx. 30, 31.

PAGE

I. RESULTS FROM EARLIER LECTURES.

The 'judgment of centuries' confirmed by 'our age.'
The Fourth Gospel accepted as the Gospel according to S. John
Inspiration is of the essence, not of the form
The vessel is not, the contents are, divine . . . 417

II. THIS DISCUSSION NOT MERELY AN *Apologia.*

The Fourth Gospel the treasure of humanity
Danger of missing it 419

III. DIFFERENT FORMS OF THE ONE GOSPEL.

Such differences necessary in a Revelation from God to man
Fundamental differences between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics

This expressed by:
(*a*) Bretschneider
(β) Renan 421

IV. THE FOURTH GOSPEL IS A TENDENCY-WRITING, AND CLAIMS TO BE SO.

The three-fold purpose stated. Baur
Difference in form admitted. Details not essential and may be here passed over. The difference as a whole is essential, and therefore the subject of inquiry 422

V. THE KEY TO THE FORM OF THE GOSPEL LIES IN *Translation*, WHICH IS NECESSARY TO THE JOHANNINE AUTHORSHIP.

A. Realization of the Apostle's position: . . . 426

PAGE

Life in Ephesus :
- (α) The Church
- (β) The concourse of peoples
- (γ) The sects of philosophy. The East. The West. Philo. The cult of Diana
- (δ) The city

The Apostle's work and teaching. The close of life. Natural desire for a record 427

B. The traditional account of the origin of the Gospel :

The circle of disciples and friends
The work, if Johannine, necessarily Ephesian
Example : The doctrine of the Logos . . . 438

C. Translation explains the uniform tone of thought and expression, and the opposing views of critics :

No human view expresses the fulness of the Divine . 442

VI. TRANSLATION A QUESTION FOR ALL TIME.

The problem of to-day
A nineteenth-century Ephesus
Relation of Universities to this problem
Army waiting for leaders. Difficulty of the task. Only leaders can lead. Leaders must lead . . 444

VII. PRACTICAL HINTS FOR YOUNGER HEARERS.

A. Characteristics of present-day thought : Law and principle. Scientific laws not ultimate . . . 453

B. The Fourth Gospel and our present 'laws' :

No plea for the temporary expressions of theology or science 456

The immensity of nature. The ultimate explanation. Scientific leaders have no word to speak :
- (α) Herbert Spencer
- (β) Tyndall
- (γ) Darwin
- (δ) Clifford
- (ε) Asa Gray 458

PAGE
'Origination' the essential thing
Answer of the Fourth Gospel
The Incarnation the only explanation of existence . 460

C. Modern ethical science :
The categorical imperative
Illustrations in modern University life and work
The true principle. Illustrations
The shadow of Christ. Altruism 461

D. Agnosticism :
Its attractiveness. Reasons
(*a*) Modern use of term
(β) S. Paul's
(γ) S. John's 465

Intellectual agnosticism necessarily true
Conclusion without premises. Examples
Agnosticism is the assertion of faith
The Fourth Gospel is a Gospel of faith, and appeals to the faculty of faith
Lessons for the individual 467

LECTURE I

THE 'JUDGMENT OF CENTURIES'

THE SECOND CENTURY: THIRD GENERATION

'IL FAUT SAVOIR DOUTER OÙ IL FAUT, ASSURER OÙ IL FAUT, ET SE SOUMETTRE OÙ IL FAUT ; QUI NE FAIT AINSI N'ENTEND PAS LA FORCE DE LA RAISON.

Pascal.

LECTURE I.

For we can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth.
2 Cor. xiii. 8.

Introduction. The subject stated:

THE subject on which I propose to speak in the present course of lectures is 'Modern Criticism.' It was suggested by a remark of the late Dr. Keim, which expresses, in the deliberate words of a man who was as reverent as he was learned, the conviction that 'Our age has cancelled the judgment of centuries.'[1] Others have expressed and have accepted, sometimes with little reverence and with little learning, similar opinions; and there has grown up around us—in the drawing-room, indeed, rather than in the lecture-room, in the magazine and in the novel, rather than in the serious and responsible treatise, in the characters of fiction and of anonymous writers, rather than in the persons of scholars of established reputation—a method of thinking, or at least of saying, that these opinions are ascertained truths which must with fuller knowledge gain general acceptance.

Modern criticism

Dr. Keim's statement was made with special reference to the Fourth Gospel; and for this reason, and the Fourth Gospel.

---

[1] 'Es ist unser Jahrhundert, welches das Urtheil der Jahrhunderte kassirt hat.' *Geschichte Jesu von Nazara*, 1867, i. pp. 103 sq. English Translation, 1873, i. p. 142.

as well as because the Fourth Gospel has been made the central position upon which the forces of modern criticism have been directed, and because it stands out pre-eminently among the treasures of the New Testament writings, I propose to confine our attention to this chief problem of present-day thought. Thus limited, our subject becomes 'Modern Criticism considered in its relation to the Fourth Gospel.' Further limitations will be imposed by the scope of this course of 'lecture-sermons,' and it will be found necessary, in order that your patience may not be unduly taxed, to add in notes, details and references in support of the principles which will be submitted.

Divisions of the subject:

The 'judgment of centuries,'

The method of examination is marked out for us in the terms of the subject. The first step will be to ascertain what, as a matter of fact, the 'judgment of centuries' on the Fourth Gospel is. With this end in view, the dawn of real knowledge in the last quarter of the second century will be a convenient starting-point, from which we may look backwards into the twilight of the preceding decades, and forwards into the history of sixteen centuries. Three short lectures will not allow us to take more than the most cursory review of these periods; but of the time at our command this may be considered a sufficient proportion. It will be the less necessary for us to enter into fuller detail, as the position of the Fourth Gospel in the second century has been the subject of much recent examination; and the history of the sixteen centuries which follow is for the most part a history of unquestioned acceptance.

'Our age.'

After arriving at an estimate of what the 'judgment of centuries' is, we shall be in a position to inquire how far 'our age' has cancelled it. For the purpose of this inquiry, and with the limits laid down for it, 'our age' dates from the close of the last century; and I propose to devote two lectures to an examination of the negative positions which have been asserted during this period. The names Evanson, Bretschneider, Strauss, Baur, Hase, Weisse, Ritschl, Keim, Scholten, Loman, Renan, will for the present sufficiently indicate the course which this examination is intended to take; and it will probably be found convenient to make the divisions which are demanded by a system of lectures, so as in the fourth lecture to take the period from Evanson to Strauss, and in the fifth, the work of Baur with the school which this master created. One lecture, at least, must be given to a brief sketch of the work of positive criticism, and one to the additions which have been made to our actual knowledge by the discovery and investigation of MSS. and other fresh materials. An opportunity will then be left for a concluding lecture, in which we may consider the influence which modern thought should have on our conceptions of the Fourth Gospel.

Width of inquiry.

Many who hear me will know well, that the plan which is thus roughly marked out embraces a wide field of inquiry, in which views, differing from each other by every degree of difference, and crossing each other at every conceivable angle, have been put forward with the claim for each that it alone could represent the truth. Some writers, indeed, have looked so exclusively to the origin of their own theories, and along the line of their own investigations, as to believe not only that all other theories and results are wrong, but that their authors must have been blinded by prejudice, or have even consciously and deliberately chosen error. Now contraries may both be wrong, and of contradictories one cannot be right; but it does not follow that the holder of either one or the other is not perfectly sincere. From a man's antecedents and position we may know what general value to put upon his judgment, and may in special cases feel bound to discount it; but we have no right to impute motives to him, or to brand him with names which he would be unwilling to apply to himself. We have heard more than enough—and painful has it been to hear—of 'counsels for creeds,' of 'ecclesiastical bigotry,' of 'professional convictions.' 'Mr. Wendover,' it will be remembered, 'in spite of his philosophy, had never been proof all his life against an anti-clerical instinct worthy almost of a Paris municipal councillor.'[2] We have heard also more than enough—and painful indeed has it been to hear—of 'advocates of atheism,' of 'criticism made subservient to party,' of 'light rejected in the interests of darkness.' A divine Judge speaking

Tone of discussion:

---

[2] *Robert Elsmere*, vol. ii. p. 243.

with the certainty of omniscience can say, 'Ye love darkness rather than light, because your deeds are evil;' but human ignorance should judge no man. Human charity will believe all things, and even when it cannot believe, will hope all things; and if there is no room left even for hope, it will endure all things.

Anti-theological prejudice.

But in our own generation it has strangely come to pass, that in questions of biblical and theological knowledge, one who holds the views which have been held, and are held, by mankind at large, especially if he holds them so strongly that he thinks it his duty to give up all else that he may teach them, and if he has devoted the best years of his life and the best thoughts of his mind to the study of them, is supposed to be *ipso facto* disqualified to judge of them. A truth is thought to be less certainly true because it is held by a man who is ready, if need be, to die for it, or—and the martyrdom is far more real—is ready to live for it; while a man is often supposed to be specially qualified to judge of alleged truths which he has hardly examined, because he thinks them *a priori* to be impossible, or because he has attained eminence in a wholly distinct region of inquiry.[3] To deny that a miracle has happened or can happen—that is, to deny that there is a divine Being, or that He has revealed or can reveal Himself to man—is a strange qualification, but it has been widely accepted as a real one, by which a man is fitted to judge without bias, of the authenticity or historic truth of a writing which asserts that miracles have occurred, and that God has revealed Himself to man. To have held, and to have ceased to hold, a public position as a teacher in the Christian Church, to have passed through all the throes of a crisis in faith, is a strange qualification by which a man is fitted to judge, without feeling or prejudice, of the new and fuller evidence of one of the sacred writings of the Church; but this is the position of many of the leaders of the negative criticism with which we shall have to deal—the position of Evanson, of Strauss, of M. Renan, of Dr. Davidson.

---

[3] See opinion of Sir George Cornewall Lewis, Lecture VI. p. 298.

M. Renan.

Mental achromatism.

M. Renan tells us, in a well-known passage, how he had learnt from Descartes

> that the first condition for discovering truth is to be free from all party. The eye must be completely achromatic if it is to find truth in philosophy or politics or morals.[4]

But is the eye completely achromatic to be attained? Is not the extreme delicacy of the optic organs in danger of being injured in the effort to attain it? Has not blindness rather than clearness of vision been sometimes the result? If complete mental achromatism, in despite of all laws of heredity and environment, were attainable, would those who could attain it be better fitted to see truth, or is the pure light of truth the result of the harmony of complex views, as the pure light of physical vision is the harmony of all the colours of the rainbow? Has the eye of the animal world, in all the gradations of genera and species, in all the width and variety of time, place, climate, light, atmosphere, temperature, been adapted to the exact object of its vision, and has the mental eye, in similar width and variety of conditions, been adapted not to clearness but to confusion, not to truth but to prejudice? Has it come to be that the primary condition of seeing truth in this nineteenth century is to break with all the training of the past, to declare the years of childhood and receptivity, the years of youth and education, the existence of schools and universities, a fatal mistake in the economy of the human race? Is the untrained eye of the untutored savage more to be trusted in the use of the complicated instruments of our modern knowledge, than the skilled eye of the observatory or the museum? That M. Renan does not mean this, is clear from more than one passage of his writings. In the preface to the book from which I have quoted, for example, he asserts that

---

[4] *Souvenirs d'Enfance et de Jeunesse*, 1883, p. 285.

> The true men of progress are those who have for their starting point a profound respect for the past.[5]

That his own effort to secure the achromatic eye which can find truth, is not an example that would induce us to follow him, is seen from the fact that, upon the subject of our present thoughts, he has in different works, and in different editions of the same work, so often changed his opinion, that one is tempted to think that the mind may itself indeed be colourless, but, like the chameleon, assuming the colour of the tree upon which it is for the moment resting. That the attempt to divest the mind of every tinge of feeling, to make it necessary to scoop out the emotions before admission to the order of critics, as it was necessary to pluck out the will before admission to the order of Jesuits, may result in paralysis of the muscles of our moral nature, and unman the man who is trying to be manly, appears from such words as the following :—

---

[5] *Souvenirs*, *ut supra*, Preface, p. xxii.

> For myself, when people deny these fundamental dogmas, I have a strong desire to believe them; when they affirm them, unless it be in good verse, I am seized with invincible doubt.[6]

This achromatism impossible:

But that the attainment of the purely achromatic mental eye is as a matter of fact impossible, is a commonplace of every-day life which is illustrated in the whole history of literature. I take some instances from English books which happen to lie close to my hand; and if I devote what may seem an undue proportion of our time to this part of the subject, it is because it lies at the root not only of the present lecture, but also of those which are to follow.

Sir James Mackintosh,

Sir James Mackintosh is ordinarily supposed to be a philosophical historian of calm and excellent judgment. He has occasion to refer to the works of Sir Henry Vane, and does so in the following terms :—

---

[6] *Séance de l'Académie Française du* 27 *Avril* 1882. *Discours de M. Pasteur. Réponse de M. Renan*, p. 41.

Sir Henry Vane was one of the most profound minds that ever existed, not inferior, perhaps, to Bacon. His works which are theological display astonishing powers. They are remarkable as containing the first direct assertion of liberty of conscience.[7]

David Hume,

Sir Henry Vane, when seen through the mind of the historian David Hume, appears in the light which follows :—

> This man, so celebrated for his parliamentary talents, and for his capacity in business, has left some writings behind him: They treat, all of them, of religious subjects, and are absolutely unintelligible: No traces of eloquence, or even of common sense, appear in them. A strange paradox! did we not know, that men of the greatest genius, where they relinquish by principle the use of their reason, are only enabled, by their vigour of mind, to work themselves the deeper into error and absurdity.[8]

It is a little difficult to realize that it is the same man and the same works; and yet Sir James Mackintosh proposed to continue the '*History of England* by David Hume.'

The Adventurer,

This example is from Dr. Hawkesworth's *Adventurer* :—

> Two men examining the same question proceed commonly like the physician and gardener in selecting herbs, or the farmer and hero looking on the plain; they bring minds impressed with different motions, and direct their inquiries

---

[7] *North American Review*, Oct. 1832; Report by A. H. Everett of a conversation between himself and Mackintosh in London, in 1817. Cf. Carlyle's depreciatory estimate of Vane in his *Cromwell*, ii. p. 6. Hosmer, *Life of young Sir Henry Vane*, 1888, pp. 492 sq.

[8] *History of Great Britain*, 1757, ii. 152.

to different ends; they form, therefore, contrary conclusions, and each wonders at the other's absurdity.[9]

'Cowardly Agnosticism,'

This is the conclusion of a recent essay on what the writer calls 'Cowardly Agnosticism':—

> I have now gone through the whole case for duty and for religion, as stated by the Agnostic school, and have shown that, as thus stated, there is no case at all. I have shown their arguments to be so shallow, so irrelevant, and so contradictory, that they never could have imposed themselves on the men who condescend to use them, if these men, upon utterly alien grounds, had not pledged themselves to the conclusion which they invoke the arguments to support.[1]

Mr. Mark Pattison,

The late Mr. Mark Pattison stood before us as the very ideal of a man who had snapped asunder every fetter of prejudice. We had forgotten, until we were lately reminded of it, that he was the translator of Thomas Aquinas's *Catena Aurea* on S. Matthew's Gospel,[2] and that he at one time lived in terror of what would become of him if he died outside the pale of the church of Rome.[3] To some of us at least he seemed to move in a higher atmosphere of calm and severe reason, and had Oxford men been asked to think of one who had attained the achromatic mental eye, his name would have come unbidden to many minds; but this is how his collected Essays strike a really able reviewer, whose right to speak can hardly be unknown:—

> If he fails, as he often seems to us to do, in the justice and balance of his appreciation of the phenomena before him,

---

[9] *Adventurer*, No. 107, Nov. 13, 1753.

[1] W. H. Mallock, *Fortnightly Review*, April 1889, p. 551.

[2] Oxford, 1841.

[3] *Memoirs*, 1885, pp. 221-2.

> if his statements and generalisations are crude and extravagant, it is that passion and deep aversions have overpowered the natural accuracy of his faculty of judgment. . . . We hear of people being spoilt by their prepossessions, their party, their prejudices, the necessities of their political and ecclesiastical position. Mr. Pattison is a warning that a man may claim the utmost independence, and yet be maimed in his power of being just and reasonable by other things than party.[4]

Fortnightly Review,

While this reviewer was writing these words, another was writing on the *Great Missionary Success* as follows :—

> 'Les préjugés,' it has been said, 'sont la défroque des gens d'esprit,' and, indeed, prejudices, judging by the general unwillingness to part from them, even when they are quite worn out, seem to be as comfortable wear as old clothes. With all of us, the accidents of early association, the chances of relationship, are sufficient to make us accept unquestioningly and hold tenaciously opinions for which we have not the slightest ground.[5]

Pope.

Yes : Pope is right—

'Tis with our judgments as our watches, none
Go just alike, yet each believes his own.[6]

Friendly and adverse witness:

Dean Stanley, in his essay on *The Creed of the Early Christians*, introduces a series of quotations the matter of which does not affect the present question, with the following formulæ :—

> It is not the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, it is Matthew Arnold, who affirms,—

. . . .

---

[4] *Guardian*, May 1, 1889, p. 685.

[5] Lady Dilke, *Fortnightly Review*, May 1889, p. 677.

[6] *Essay on Criticism*, part i. lines 9, 10.

Dean Stanley.

It is not Bishop Lightfoot, it is the author of 'Supernatural Religion,' who asserts,—

. . . .

It is not Lord Shaftesbury, it is the author of 'Ecce Homo,' who says,—

. . . .

It is no Bampton lecturer, it is John Stuart Mill, who says,—

. . . .

It is not Lacordaire, it is Renan, who affirms,—[7]

. . . .

Now these formulæ show that the force of a statement was in the opinion of Dean Stanley the stronger, because it was not made by a person who would naturally have been expected to make it, but by one whose general habit of thought was in the opposite direction, and by whom the opposite would have been stated, if it could have been stated by anyone.[8] And no one questions that in a large degree it is so; but the superior validity of evidence which arises simply from the fact that it comes from an adverse witness, may be more than balanced by the superior knowledge of a friendly witness, or by his consciousness of the enormous stake which is at issue both for others and for himself, and his consequent painful anxiety to state the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Few who have followed the whole course of the controversy will be prepared to admit, that a statement favourable to Christianity would, if made by the author of *Supernatural Reli-*

---

[7] *Christian Institutions*, 1882, cap. xiv. pp. 273 sq.

[8] Cf. Whateley, *Elements of Rhetoric*, 1846, ed. 7, p. 64.

gion, be stronger than one made by Bishop Lightfoot. The real question which lies at the root of an inquiry such as we are undertaking is, Are we in the spirit of our text, and without influence of purpose or fear of result, seekers after truth? Do we plead as advocates, or weigh evidence as judges? An advocate is from his very position one-sided; a judge should be impartial: an advocate will present and make prominent all the facts and arguments which tell in favour of his own contention, and will suppress or keep in the background, as far as he honourably can, all which are opposed to it; a judge should take care that the facts on both sides are equally present to his mind, and that nothing which is important to the result shall be passed over or unfairly dealt with. Now no one who realizes the true issues in any question which affects Christianity, or the position of one of its sacred books, could possibly assume the character of an advocate unless it were for the purpose of establishing the truth. I shall not venture to state at this moment, but I hope the statement will assert itself before these lectures shall be concluded, that a Bampton Lecturer, if indeed an advocate, is one who pleads in the temple of truth, and before a Judge to Whom the secrets of the thoughts of the heart are known. 'We can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth.' He has perhaps little right to complain if he is sometimes supposed to be merely 'a counsel for creeds.' The conclusions at which his investigations will

Advocate or judge?

Position of a Bampton Lecturer.

arrive are more or less fully known before they are completed. If they are not such as can be with propriety expressed in 'Divinity Lecture Sermons,' in accord with 'the last will and testament of the late Rev. John Bampton,' he has no right to deliver them on this Foundation. But he may urge, that no man is compelled to be Bampton Lecturer, and that no man would accept the office if the honest results of his own investigations were not in accordance with the conditions imposed. It is indeed conceivable that the more complete examination of his subject may lead him to conclusions which are inconsistent with the will of the Founder, but in that case his duty would be clear. Upon the altar of truth everything must be sacrificed: traditional beliefs, friendships, office, position, prospects, everything. Sacrificed? Yes; but it is only in the sacrifice that the offerer knows what the chief blessing of life really is. Sacrificed? Yes; but 'the truth shall make you free':—

> *Truth*, which only doth judge itself, teacheth, that the Inquiry of *Truth*, which is the Love-making or Wooing of it; the Knowledge of *Truth*, which is the Presence of it; and the Belief of *Truth*, which is the enjoying of it; is the Sovereign Good of human Nature.[9]

I make no claim then to enter upon my subject without definite convictions upon it, nor do I claim freedom from the bias which necessarily accompanies definite convictions, and from which I believe no man, and least of all the discoverer of a new theory, or the possessor of the completely achromatic eye, to be free; but I claim nevertheless to enter upon it with the one purpose of seeking the truth, and helping my younger brethren to seek it:—

---

[9] Bacon's *Essays*: 1, Of Truth.

> Aufrichtig zu seyn kann ich versprechen: unparteiisch zu seyn aber nicht.[1]

Evidence of the second century:

The first question which has been marked out for inquiry is the evidence for the reception of the Fourth Gospel which is furnished by the second century; and in examining a question which is admittedly made difficult by the scantiness of the remnants of literature which have come down to us, it will be simpler to pass from the more known to the less known, and to trace the lines of investigation backwards. The main lines have during these later years been sufficiently disclosed by the labours of many eminent scholars, prominent among whom are Bishop Lightfoot and our own Professor of Exegesis, the Cambridge Professors Westcott and Hort, and the Cambridge editor of Irenæus the late Mr. Wigan Harvey, Dr. Salmon of Dublin, Dr. Charteris of Edinburgh, the too little known and too early lost Dr. Ezra Abbot of Harvard; and, on the Continent, Drs. Baur, Credner, Schwegler, Von Otto, Oehler, Rönsch, Hilgenfeld, Schürer, Weizsäcker, Lipsius, Zahn, and Harnack. But almost every day sheds its new side-lights on these investigations, and of some of them I hope to speak in a future lecture. For our immediate purpose it will be sufficient to deal with the main facts in the presence of these lights; and the facts may be conveniently grouped in three periods, corresponding with the three generations of human life at the end, the middle, and the beginning of the century.

---

[1] Goethe, *Ethisches*, 3te Abtheil.

The third generation:

We will, in the first place, then, inquire of the generation which lived towards the close of the second century.

Church of Lyons: Irenæus, fl.174–189.

Irenæus is the most important person in the literary history of the Gospels. He stands at the very dawn of the period when this history emerged from twilight into clear day; and it is as certain that the Fourth Gospel existed in substantially the same form as that in which we now possess it, in the days of Irenæus, as that it exists in our present English Bibles. We know moreover without doubt that Irenæus succeeded the venerable Pothinus in the episcopal see of Lyons in the year A.D. 177 or 178. His great work[2] against Gnosticism was probably written during the early years of his episcopate, about A.D. 180–185. The five books of which the work is composed were not all issued at the same time; but the date of the third book, which is our most important witness, is roughly fixed by the statement that

His work against Gnosticism.

---

[2] Ἔλεγχος καὶ ἀνατροπὴ τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως which is commonly quoted by the shorter title Πρὸς τὰς αἱρέσεις, *Contra Hæreses*, or κατὰ αἱρέσεων, *Adversus Hæreses* or *Adversus Hæreticos*.

Eleutherus, the twelfth from the Apostles, was then bishop of Rome. It was in any case therefore not later than A.D. 189, and not earlier than A.D. 174 or 175.[3]

His use of the Fourth Gospel.

Now in this third book, Irenæus not only quotes largely from the Fourth Gospel as he does elsewhere, but he also tells us in the most definite terms that John, the disciple of the Lord, who also leaned on His breast, put forth his Gospel while he abode in Ephesus in Asia;[4] that in the course of preaching this faith, John, the disciple of the Lord, being desirous by the preaching of the Gospel to remove the error which Cerinthus had been sowing among men, and long before him those who are called Nicolaitans[5] . . . . began the instruction which his Gospel contains; that the school of Valentinus made very full use of the Gospel of John, and were from that very Gospel shown to be wholly in error;[6] and he seeks to demonstrate by the fanciful analogy with the four regions and the four winds and the four faces of the Cherubim, the four forms of the living creatures,[7] the four covenants, that there could be only four Gospels; and that the Gospel according to S. John, which he places first in order, answers to the character of the lion, which is the first living creature, and is full of confidence, and therefore tells in its opening words of the princely and glorious birth from the Father.[8]

---

[3] Cf. Lipsius, *Chronologie der Römischen Bischöfe*, pp. 184 sqq.; article *Irenæus* in Smith and Wace's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, iii. pp. 253 sqq.; and Bishop Lightfoot, *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, pp. 260 sqq.

[4] *Adv. Hær.* lib. iii. cap. i. § 1; ed. Harvey, tom. ii. p. 6.

[5] *Ibid.* cap. x. § 1; *ibid.* p. 40.

[6] *Ibid.* cap. xi. § 7; *ibid.* p. 46.

[7] Rev. iv. 7.

The fact of the acceptance of the Fourth Gospel by Irenæus and by both Catholics and Gnostics of his time, is placed then beyond any possible question.

Church of Alexandria:

Clement, fl.190–203. His origin, and teachers.

While Irenæus was thus presiding over the see of Lyons, and defending it from the Valentinian heresy which had invaded the valley of the Rhone, Titus Flavius Clemens, who was probably an Athenian by birth, and was widely read in the philosophy and literature of Greece, had passed, as he himself tells us,[9] from his other teachers in Greece and Italy and Asia Minor and Palestine to his true master, last in order but first in power, whom he found hidden in Egypt. This was almost certainly Pantænus who was head of the catechetical school at Alexandria. Clement became under his influence a presbyter, and, after probably acting for a time as his assistant, succeeded him, and was eminent as the great Alexandrian teacher for a period which cannot be determined with certainty, but probably rather more than covered the last decade of the second century.

His pupils.

Origen was among his distinguished pupils, and perhaps Hippolytus learned of him as well as of Irenæus. Now Clement naturally asks no question and has no doubt about the Fourth Gospel. He names the series and nationality of his teachers in order to lay stress upon the fact, that these men 'preserved the tradition of doctrine directly from the holy Apostles Peter, James, John, and Paul, son receiving it from father—though few were like their fathers—until by God's will the seeds of truth from ancestors and Apostles came unto them.'[1] He tells us again how John, writing after the other Evangelists, and perceiving that the external facts had been set forth by them, being divinely influenced by the Spirit and encouraged by his friends, composed a spiritual Gospel.[2] In another place Clement declines to give credence to an apocryphal statement which was made on the authority of the gospel of the Egyptians—and the passage is of wider importance in the history of the Canon and in the question of Clement's use of apocryphal writings, than the inference which we are now deriving from it—on the definite ground that it was not to be found in the four Gospels which had been handed down.[3]

---

[8] *Loc. cit.* cap. xi. § 8; *ut supra*, pp. 47 sq.

[9] *Stromateis*, i. 1. § 11; ed. Klotz, tom. ii. p. 9. Cf. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* v. 11.

John and the 'spiritual Gospel.'

The well-known story of John and the youth who was captured by the robber band, is introduced by the statement that it is a story, or rather that it is a real record of John the Apostle, which was preserved in the memory and handed down; and that the Apostle, after the death of the tyrant, had returned from Patmos to Ephesus, and had gone to the heathen regions in the neighbourhood, here appointing bishops, there founding new churches, in a third place setting apart for the ministry those who were chosen by the Holy Spirit.[4]

---

[1] *Stromateis, ut supra.*

[2] Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* vi. 14.

[3] *Stromateis*, iii. 13, § 93; ed. Klotz, tom. ii. p. 266.

The frequent use by Clement of individual passages in the Fourth Gospel is unquestioned. In the *Exhortation to the Heathen*, he quotes each of the Gospels, and SS. Matthew, Luke, and John frequently, but he mentions only S. John by name.[5]

Churches of Rome and Carthage: Tertullian, c. 150–240.

His position as a writer.

Tertullian is almost an unknown person, apart from his writings and from the impression which these writings have produced upon the thought and language of both the Church and individuals. But what an impression it has been! 'Give me the Master,' was the formula with which Cyprian, bishop of Tertullian's native town, asked for his works which he read daily.[6] 'What can exceed the learning, what the perception of Tertullian?' asks Jerome, and he finds answer to his own question: 'His Apology and his treatises against the heathen embrace all the erudition of the age.'[7] And in our own day a master of both thought and style calls him 'the most powerful writer of the early centuries.'[8]

---

[4] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* iii. 23.

[5] *Protreptikos*, § 59; ed. Klotz, tom. i. p. 52.

[6] '. . . referreque sibi solitum nunquam Cyprianum absque Tertulliani lectione unum diem præterisse, ac sibi crebro dicere, *Da Magistrum*: Tertullianum videlicet significans.' Jerome, *De Viris illustribus*, cap. liii.; ed. Benedict., Verona, 1735, tom. ii. p. 877. Cf. 'Et beatus Cyprianus Tertulliano magistro utitur, ut ejus scripta probant; quumque eruditi et ardentis viri delectetur ingenio, Montanum cum eo Maximillamque non sequitur.' *Ibid.* tom. i. p. 519–20.

[7] 'Quid Tertulliano eruditius, quid acutius? Apologeticus ejus, et contra Gentes libri, cunctam sæculi obtinent disciplinam.' *Ibid.* tom. i. p. 427.

His training.

We shall certainly be not far from right, if we place his life at from the middle of the second to about the third or fourth decade of the third century, that is from about A.D. 150 or 160 to A.D. 230–240. We know further that he was born at Carthage, and that he was a convert from heathenism; and his skill in argument, his judicial power of estimating evidence, and his use of legal terms, all suggest what is in itself likely in the case of the son of a captain of a Roman legion, that he was trained for official, perhaps legal employment. Carthage and Rome are the only centres in which we find traces of his life and work as a layman, as a presbyter, as a Catholic, as a Montanist. Eusebius tells us that, in addition to his general eminence, he was specially distinguished among the chief men of Rome; and that his *Apology*, which was written for Roman Christians, was also translated into Greek.[9] Tertullian himself tells us incidentally, when speaking of the value of gems depending only on their rarity, of his own presence at Rome.[1] Jerome moreover accounts for his lapse to Montanism by the treatment which he received at the hands of the Roman clergy;[2] but it was in Carthage that he laboured as a Montanist, and it was in North Africa that the 'Tertullianists' took their rise.

---

[8] Cardinal Newman, *Tracts Theological and Ecclesiastical*, p. 220.

[9] *Hist. Eccles.* ii. 2.

[1] 'Gemmarum quoque nobilitatem vidimus *Romæ* de fastidio Parthorum et Medorum ceterorumque gentilium suorum coram matronis erubescentem, nisi quod nec ad ostentationem fere habentur.' *De Cultu Feminarum*, i. 7; ed. Oehler, tom. i. p. 709.

[2] 'Hic cum usque ad mediam ætatem presbyter Ecclesiæ per-

His frequent quotations from the Fourth Gospel.

Tertullian is then a witness speaking at once from the rival cities of Rome and Carthage, from the bosom of the Church and from the heresy of semi-Montanism. His writings contain constant citations of Holy Scripture, and a reference to a good index[3] will show that there are quotations from every chapter, and in some chapters from almost every verse, of the Fourth Gospel.

Passages from his works:

More important than these quotations are the passages in which Tertullian dwells on the unity and corporate life of the Church, and bases the reception of her sacred writings upon their immediate derivation from Apostolic sources. Thus in the *Demurrer against Heretics*, he says:—

rule against heretics,

> From this, therefore, we draw up a rule. If the Lord Jesus Christ sent forth Apostles to preach, no preachers are to be received except those whom Christ commissioned, because no one has known the Father but the Son and he to whom the Son has revealed Him, and the Son does not seem to have revealed Him to any but to the Apostles whom He sent to preach; and of course they preached that which He revealed to them. But what they preached, that is what Christ revealed to them, can be known—and here I must lay down a rule again—only by means of those churches which

---

mansisset, invidia postea et contumeliis clericorum Romanæ Ecclesiæ, ad Montani dogma delapsus . . . .' *De Viris illustribus, ut supra*, cap. liii. tom. ii. pp. 875 sqq.

[3] See especially the *Index Scripturarum* in Oehler's edition.

the Apostles themselves founded and themselves declared the Gospel to them, both *vivâ voce*, to use a common expression, and afterwards by means of letters. But if this be so, it is also clear that all doctrine which agrees with those Apostolic churches which are the wombs and sources of the faith, must be accepted as truth, for it undoubtedly contains that which those churches received from Apostles, Apostles from Christ, and Christ from God. It follows, on the other hand, that all doctrine is known beforehand to be false which savours of contrariety to the truth of the churches, of Apostles, of Christ, of God. It remains, therefore, for us to show whether this our doctrine, the line of which we have set forth above, has its origin in the Apostolic tradition, and whether all others do not *ipso facto* proceed from falsehood. We have communion with the churches of the Apostles in that our doctrine is in no way different. This is the witness of truth.[4]

A few pages later in the same tract, he expresses the same thought in these words :—

the Apostolic churches,

. . . . run through the churches of the Apostles in which the very thrones of the Apostles are still prominent in their places, in which their own authentic letters are read, so that the voice and face of each is recalled. You are close to Achaia, and there you have Corinth. Or you are not far from Macedonia, and there you have Philippi and the Thessalonians. Or you are able to go as far as Asia, and there you find Ephesus. Or again you are close to Italy, and there is Rome from whence we also have our authority at hand. Happy indeed is that church for which Apostles poured forth their whole teaching as well as their blood; where Peter suffers like his Lord, where Paul is crowned by a death like John's [i.e. the Baptist's], where the Apostle John, after he had been plunged into boiling oil and escaped unhurt, is sent back to his island! Let us see what this church has learned, what she has taught, what communion she has had with our own churches in Africa.[5]

---

[4] *De Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, cap. xxi. ; ed. Oehler, tom. ii. p. 19.

authors of 'Evangelical Instrument,'

In like manner, when replying to Marcion, Tertullian takes the following position :—

> We assert, to begin with, that the Evangelical Instrument[6] has for its authors Apostles, on whom this duty of proclaiming the Gospel has been imposed by the Lord Himself. And if there are also some who are Apostolic but not Apostles, these are not alone, but they are with Apostles and after Apostles; for the preaching of disciples might be suspected of some envying of glory if it were not supported by the authority of their masters—yes, by the authority of Christ, which made the Apostles masters. Of the Apostles then, John and Matthew first plant faith in us, and of Apostolic persons Luke and Mark renew it.[7]

Apostles handed down that which was from the beginning,

A little further on in the same treatise, he sums up in these words :—

> If it is clear that the earlier is the truer, and that the earlier is that which was from the beginning, and that from the beginning is that which was from the Apostles; then at all events it will be equally clear that that is handed down from the Apostles which was sacred among the churches of the Apostles. Let us see what milk the Corinthians drew from S. Paul, by what standard the Galatians were corrected, what the Philippians, the Thessalonians, the Ephesians read; what sound the Romans give forth who are close at hand, and to whom both Peter and Paul left a Gospel sealed by their own blood. We have also the churches which are children of John. For though Marcion rejected his Apocalypse, still the order of bishops, when traced to its origin, will rest upon John

---

[5] *De Præscr. Hær.* cap. xxxvi.; ed. Oehler, tom. ii. pp. 33 sq.

[6] Tertullian uses *Instrumentum*, perhaps because as a legal term it implies validity, as equivalent to *Testamentum*. Cf. *Adv. Marc.* iv. 1, 'alterius instrumenti vel, quod magis usui est dicere, testamenti.'

[7] *Adversus Marcion.* iv. 2; ed. Oehler, tom. ii. p. 162.

> as founder. In like manner is the noble origin of the other churches recognised. I say then that among them, and not only among those planted by Apostles, but among all churches which are bound together in the Christian fellowship (*de societate sacramenti confœderantur*) that Gospel of Luke which we most earnestly defend, has stood its ground from its first publication . . . The same authority of the Apostolic churches will support the other Gospels which we have equally through them and according to their use. I mean the Gospels of John and Matthew, while that which Mark published may be maintained to be Peter's, whose interpreter Mark was. . . . These are the summary arguments which we use when we do battle for the faith of the Gospel against heretics, maintaining both the order of time which sets aside the later works as belonging to forgers, and the authority of churches which supports the tradition of the Apostles; because truth necessarily precedes falsehood, and comes from those by whom it has been handed down.[8]

Or once again, when opposing Praxeas, he speaks of S. John in the following terms:—

the Evangelist and beloved disciple.

> In what way these things were said, the Evangelist and beloved disciple John knew better than Praxeas.[9]

From Antioch, we have similar clear and definite evidence. The sixth bishop of this see in succession from the Apostles was Theophilus.[1] He addressed three books on the elements of the faith to Autolycus, and wrote a work, *Against the Heresy of Hermogenes*, in which he uses testimony from the Revelation of S. John. He also wrote some catechetical works, and a work of no mean order against Marcion,

Church of Antioch: Theophilus, fl. c. 171–185.

His writings,

---

[8] Tertullian, *Adversus Marcion.* iv. 5; ed. Oehler, tom. ii. pp. 165–7.

[9] *Adversus Praxean*, cap. xxiii.; ed. Oehler, tom. ii. pp. 686.

[1] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* iv. 20.

all of which were preserved in the time of Eusebius, to whose *History* we are indebted for this description of them.[2]

testified to by Jerome and Eusebius.

His *Commentary on the Gospels* doubtful.

Jerome also refers to the works of Theophilus from personal knowledge of them,[3] and makes some additions to the list in Eusebius. We know further from the *Chronicle* of Eusebius that he stood out as a writer of literary eminence, many of whose books were in wide circulation.[4] The only one of these works which is now certainly extant is that addressed to Autolycus.[5] A lively controversy on the question of the *Commentary on the Gospels* attributed to Theophilus, to which I refer only to pass over it, has engaged the powers of Professors Zahn and Harnack, the former earnestly maintaining, and the latter not less earnestly denying, the genuineness and authenticity of the writing.[6] Dr. Zahn returns to the battle in his *History of the Canon of the New Testament* which is now being published,[7] and the last word has not yet been spoken on the subject. But this part of the testimony is at least open to grave doubts, and our witnesses must be above suspicion.

---

[2] *Hist. Eccles.* iv. 24.

[3] *De Vir. illust.* cap. xxv.; *ut supra*, tom. ii. p. 853–4.

[4] Eusebius, *Chron.* ad ann. ix. Marcus Aurelius—

'Αντιοχείας ἕκτος ἐπίσκοπος Θεόφιλος ἔτη ιγ'. Θεοφίλου τούτου συγγράμματα διάφορά εἰσι καὶ φέρονται. *Sync.* 665, 21.

'Antiochenorum ecclesiæ vi episcopus constitutus est Theophilus, cuius multi libri hucusque circumferuntur.' *Versio Armenia.*

'Antiochenæ vi episcopus ordinatur Theophilus, cuius plurima ingenii opera extant.' *Eusebi Chronicorum Canonum.* Alfred Schoene, Berolini, 1866, tom. ii. pp. 170–1.

[5] *Ad Autolycum.* It has been excellently edited by Von Otto, and forms the eighth volume of the *Corpus Apologetarum Christianorum sæculi secundi.* The prolegomena give full information about the works of Theophilus. Cf. Donaldson, *History of Christian Literature*, vol. iii. pp. 63 sqq.; and the interesting article by Canon Venables in Smith and Wace's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, iv. pp. 993 sqq.

[6] Zahn, *Forschungen*, 1883–4, 2 Theil, 3 Theil, Beilage iii.; Von Gebhardt und Harnack, *Texte u. Untersuchungen,* Bd. i. Heft 1, 2,

Treatise *To Autolycus*, c.183–185.

The work, *To Autolycus*, is above suspicion.[8] It is an address in three books, written for a real or imaginary heathen friend of wide learning and high culture. It represents therefore, though not a formal apology, the ablest apologetic literature of the time,[9] that is, about A.D. 183–185,[1] and it gives its own evidence of the kind of man who wrote it. This is the author's view of testimony :—

> It was fitting that writers should have seen with their own eyes those things about which they make statements, or else should have accurately learnt them from those who had seen them. For those who write about things which are uncertain are as if they were beating the air.[2]

His undoubted

And this is the witness which he himself gives about the Fourth Gospel.

---

pp. 282–298 ; Heft 4, pp. 97–175. Cf. Sanday, *Studia Biblica*, 1885, pp. 89–101.

[7] *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons*, 1888, Bd. i. pp. 29 sq., and p. 177.

[8] 'Hiernach scheint ein ernsthafter Zweifel an der Tradition des Eusebius, dass der Bischof Theophilus von Antiochien der Verfasser sei, nicht mehr möglich.' Von Gebhardt und Harnack, *ut supra*, p. 289.

[9] 'Un docteur tres fécond, un catéchiste doué d'un grand talent d'exposition, un polémiste habile selon les idées du temps.' Renan, *Marc Aurèle*, p. 386.

[1] The date is shown by internal evidence to be rather later than A.D. 177 (ad ann. xvii. Marc. Aurel.), which is given for the death of Theophilus in the *Chronicle* of Eusebius. See Bishop Lightfoot, *S. Ignatius*, vol. ii. ed. 1, p. 466 ; ed. 2, p. 468.

[2] Lib. iii. cap. ii. ; ed. Von Otto, *ut supra*, tom. viii. p. 189.

reference to the Fourth Gospel.

In the thirteenth chapter of the first book, he speaks of the resurrection, and uses the following analogy :—

> When a grain of wheat or of any other seed is cast into the earth, it first dies and is dissolved, and afterwards is raised and grows into the ear.

This naturally reminds us of the similar analogy in the Fourth Gospel,[3] but it is not necessarily a quotation from it, for some of the words are still more nearly allied to the passage in the First Epistle to the Corinthians :—

> Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit.[4]

The next chapter opens with the words, 'Be not therefore without faith, but have faith,' which at once reminds us of, though they are not quite identical with, our Lord's words to S. Thomas, 'Be not faithless, but believing.'[5]

In the twenty-third chapter of the second book, there is a reference to the

> pains of childbirth which women suffer and afterwards forget, that the word of God may be fulfilled and the human race may increase.

---

[3] κόκκος σίτου ἢ τῶν λοιπῶν σπερμάτων, ἐπὰν βληθῇ εἰς τὴν γῆν, πρῶτον ἀποθνήσκει καὶ λύεται, εἶτα ἐγείρεται καὶ γίνεται στάχυς. Theophilus, *Ad Autolycum*, lib. i. 13 ; ed. Von Otto, *Corpus Apologetarum*, viii. 38, 7.

ἐὰν μὴ ὁ κόκκος τοῦ σίτου πεσὼν εἰς τὴν γῆν ἀποθάνῃ, αὐτὸς μόνος μένει· ἐὰν δὲ ἀποθάνῃ, πολὺν καρπὸν φέρει. John xii. 24.

[4] 1 Cor. xv. 36, sq.

[5] Μὴ οὖν ἀπίστει, ἀλλὰ πίστευε. *Ibid.* i. 14 ; ed. Von Otto, viii. 42, 1.

Μὴ γίνου ἄπιστος ἀλλὰ πιστός. John xx. 27.

And it is at least probable that the writer had in his mind the words of our Lord :—

> A woman when she is in travail hath sorrow, because her hour is come : but as soon as she is delivered of the child, she remembereth no more the anguish, for joy that a man is born into the world.[6]

Perhaps also there is a reference, as Drs. Von Otto and Zahn both think, in the twenty-ninth chapter of the same book, when the writer speaks of the entrance of death into this world as resulting from Satan's causing Cain to kill Abel,[7] to the declaration, 'He was a murderer from the beginning ;' but here again, did the passage stand by itself, we could not lay much stress upon it, as a similar thought occurs in the First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians.[8]

But the passages do not stand by themselves. The special interest of these references, which are slight when taken alone—though, as will be seen, the parallelism of the Greek words is very remarkable—

---

[6] Καὶ *μετὰ τοῦτο λήθην τοῦ πόνου ποιοῦνται, ὅπως πληρωθῇ ὁ τοῦ* Θεοῦ *λόγος εἰς τὸ αὐξάνεσθαι καὶ πληθύνεσθαι τὸ γένος τῶν ἀνθρώπων.* *Ibid.* ii. 23 ; ed. Von Otto, viii. 120, 3. 'Alludit ad Ioann. xvi. 21.'

ὅταν δὲ γεννήσῃ τὸ παιδίον, οὐκέτι μνημονεύει τῆς θλίψεως διὰ τὴν χαρὰν ὅτι ἐγεννήθη ἄνθρωπος εἰς τὸν κόσμον. John xvi. 21.

[7] Καὶ *οὕτως ἀρχὴ θανάτου ἐγένετο εἰς τόνδε τὸν κόσμον ὁδοιπορεῖν ἕως τοῦ δεῦρο ἐπὶ πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων.* *Ibid.* ii. 29 ; ed. Von Otto, viii. 138, 8.

ἐκεῖνος ἀνθρωποκτόνος ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς. John viii. 44. Cf. *οὐ καθὼς* Καὶν *ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἦν καὶ ἔσφαξεν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ.* 1 John iii. 12.

[8] *δι' οὗ καὶ θάνατος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον.* Clemens Rom. 1 Cor. iii. *ad fin.*, Lightfoot, ed. 1, p. 42 ; ed. 2, ii. p. 21.

and that which makes them of great importance, is that they are found side by side with an undoubted quotation from the Fourth Gospel. This is one of the many instances which show the incidental way in which reference may be made to a work which is well known to the writer.

Gospel included among 'Holy Scriptures,'

That the Fourth Gospel was well known is clear from the quotation which occurs in the twenty-second chapter of this same second book of the Apology, where Theophilus says :—

> Whence we are taught by the Holy Scriptures and all spirit-bearing men, among whom John says: 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God,' showing that at first God was alone and the Word in Him. Then he saith, 'And the Word was God. All things were made by Him; and without Him was not any thing made.'[9]

author among 'spirit-bearing men.'

This distinct reference to S. John by name, this inclusion of him among 'spirit-bearing men,' and this exact citation of his words, occur in a context in which the writer has been dealing with the Scriptures

---

[9] Ὅθεν διδάσκουσιν ἡμᾶς αἱ ἅγιαι γραφαὶ καὶ πάντες οἱ πνευματοφόροι, ἐξ ὧν Ἰωάννης λέγει· Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν·	Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν,
δεικνὺς ὅτι ἐν πρώτοις μόνος ἦν ὁ Θεὸς καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ὁ λόγος. Ἔπειτα λέγει· καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος· πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν. *Ut supra*, ii. 22; ed. Von Otto, viii. 118, 120, 13–15.	καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος . . . πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν. John i. 1–3. Westcott and Hort.

πνευματοφόροι is the accentuation of the codices. See Von Otto's note 13, *ad loc.*; and cf. cap. 9, note 1, and lib. iii. cap. 12 *infra*.

of the Old Testament, and it is impossible to deny that he thinks and writes of the Fourth Gospel as a divinely inspired work, which is to be placed on a level with the Law and the Prophets. If there were room for doubt as to his meaning, it would disappear before such words as are found at the beginning of the twelfth chapter of the third book :—

> Now concerning righteousness of which the Law speaks, the statements of the Prophets and Gospels are in harmony because all spirit-bearing men speak by one Spirit of God.[1]

Churches of Asia Minor:

The churches of Asia Minor must necessarily appear as witnesses, when the question is the origin of the Fourth Gospel. Nor are they silent in the period to which our inquiry is directed. Two great controversies, both of which took their rise from the churches of Asia, then divided Christendom from Ephesus to Lyons, from Alexandria to Carthage and Rome. One is known to us from the name of its author, as Montanism ; the other from its subject, as the Paschal controversy. Montanism, with its central doctrine of the Paraclete, cannot avoid touching the writings of S. John, in which alone of the sacred Scriptures the term Paraclete occurs ; and the disputants in the Paschal controversy, which is immediately concerned with the practice of the Asiatic churches, cannot avoid some reference to the Scrip-

---

[1] *Ἔτι μὴν καὶ περὶ δικαιοσύνης, ἧς ὁ νόμος εἴρηκεν, ἀκόλουθα εὑρίσκεται καὶ τὰ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῶν εὐαγγελίων ἔχειν, διὰ τὸ τοὺς πάντας πνευματοφόρους ἑνὶ πνεύματι Θεοῦ λελαληκέναι.* *Ibid.* iii. 12 ; ed. Von Otto, viii. 218, 1.

Witnesses from Sardis and Hierapolis:

tures which they received. Now towards the close of the second century, two Asiatic bishops, Melito of Sardis the capital of Lydia, and Apolinaris[2] of Hierapolis in Phrygia, were voluminous and widely read authors. Their writings are at present known to us only by scanty fragments; but Eusebius and Jerome[3] have preserved the titles of their works, and we can form a probable opinion of the nature and extent of their influence.

Melito, fl. 150–180.

The period of Melito's literary activity may be taken as from about A.D. 150 to 180. The area of that activity may be estimated from the following list of his works, which is given by Eusebius as an imperfect one and based only on his own personal knowledge:—

List in Eusebius.

1. *On the Paschal Festival* (two books).
2. *On the right method of Life and on the Prophets.*
3. *On the Church.*
4. *On the Lord's Day.*
5. *On the Faith of Man.*
6. *On the Creation of Man.*[4]
7. *On the Obedience of Faith.*
8. *On the Senses.*
9. *On the Soul and Body.*
10. *On Baptism.*
11. *On Truth.*

---

[2] Ἀπολινάριος constanter apud Græcos dicitur, non Ἀπολλινάριος, quod exspectabas, h.e. Latinorum *Apollinaris* . . . Von Otto, *Corpus*, ix. 479.

[3] *De Viris illustribus*, capp. xxiv. xxvi.; ed. Bened., *ut supra*, tom. ii. pp. 851 sqq.

[4] περὶ πλάσεως. Rendered 'On Creation' by Bishop Lightfoot, *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, p. 225; and 'On the Formation of the World' by Dr. Westcott, *On the Canon*, ed. 6, p. 223. But the word seems to have acquired a technical sense which was limited to the creation of man. Cf. Gen. ii. 7, LXX; 1 Tim. ii. 13; Justin, *Dial. c. Tryph.* cap. 40. See esp. Von Otto's note, *Corpus*, tom. ix. p. 392; and Von Gebhardt und Harnack, *Texte u. Untersuchungen*, Bd. i. p. 246.

12. *On the Creation and Birth of Christ.*
13. *On Prophecy.*
14. *On Love of Strangers.*
15. *The Key.*[5]
16. *On the Devil and the Apocalypse of John.*
17. *On a Corporeal God.*
18. *An Apology to Antoninus.*
19. *Extracts from the Law and the Prophets* (six books).[6]

Other lists.

Some other works which are ascribed to Melito by later writers are of doubtful authority; but it is probable that the treatise *On the Incarnation of Christ*, from the third book of which Anastatius of Sinai quotes, when writing in the seventh century, against the Monophysites, and that *On the Passion*, which is also quoted by Anastatius;[7] and the writings *On the Faith* and *On the Cross*, which are now known only from Syriac fragments,[8] are genuine works which are not included in the Eusebian list. The Syriac furnishes also fragments of an *Apology* to Antoninus, which no less an authority than Dr. Westcott thinks to be a 'genuine book of Melito of Sardis,'[9] and which clearly shows the influence of S. John's writings. Its authenticity cannot however be said to be quite certain,[1] and I do not therefore lay any stress upon it.

---

[5] This work does not exist in the Syriac MS. version of Eusebius; and the attempt of Cardinal Pitra to prove that the Clermont MS. contains a Latin translation of the second century Greek original, cannot be said to be successful. Cf. *Spicilegium Solesmense*, tom. ii. pp. 1–519; iii. pp. 1–307; and Steitz, *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1857, p. 584.

[6] *Hist. Eccles.* iv. 26.

[7] ʽΟδηγός seu dux viæ adversus Acephalos, ed. Gretser, 1806, c. xii. p. 216; xiii. p. 260.

[8] Cf. Cureton, *Spicilegium Syriacum*, 1855, pp. 52–3.

[9] *Canon of the New Testament*, ed. 6, p. 222.

[1] Cf. Lecture VII. p. 408.

Apolinaris, fl. 171.

Lists in Eusebius,

Claudius Apolinaris, a successor of Papias in the see of Hierapolis, was a somewhat younger contemporary of Melito. Eusebius speaks of him as a strong and irresistible weapon against Montanism,[2] and refers to several works by him which were preserved by many, and gives the titles of four which were known to himself:—[3]

1. *An Apology* addressed to Marcus Aurelius.
2. *Against the Greeks* (five books).
3. *On Truth* (two books).[4]
4. *Against the Heresy of the Phrygians* (Montanists).

Theodoret,

Theodoret refers to a work *Against the Severians*,[5] which is otherwise unknown, and notes the wide acquaintance of Apolinaris with general literature.[6]

and Photius.

Photius of Constantinople, writing as late as the ninth century, relates that he had read three works by Apolinaris, *Against the Greeks*, *On Godliness*, and *On Truth*, which may be wholly or partly identical with parallel works in the list of Eusebius, and adds:—

> There are said to be other works of this author which are worthy of notice, but we have not yet met with them.[7]

---

[2] *Hist. Eccles.* v. 16.

[3] *Ibid.* iv. 27.

[4] 'Textus Vulgatus ap. Euseb. addit: *καὶ πρὸς Ἰουδαίους πρῶτον καὶ δεύτερον.* Sed hæc verba non comparent in optimis codd. mstis (B C D F^{a} K R^{a}) neque apud Ruffinum et Hieronymum: quapropter, quum a librario quodam moleste sedulo addita sint, recte omittuntur a Læmmero et Heinicheno.' Von Otto, *Corpus*, tom. ix. p. 481, note 3.

[5] *Hæreticarum Fabularum Compendium*, i. 21; ed. Migne, iv. p. 372.

[6] *ἀνὴρ ἀξιέπαινος, καὶ πρὸς τῇ γνώσει τῶν θείων καὶ τὴν ἔξωθεν παιδείαν προσειληφώς.* *Hæret. Fab. ut supra*, iii. 2; *ibid.* p. 404.

[7] *Ἀνεγνώσθη Ἀπολιναρίου πρὸς Ἕλληνας καὶ περὶ εὐσεβείας καὶ περὶ ἀληθείας. ἔστι δὲ Ἱεραπολίτης ὁ συγγραφεύς, τῆς ἐν Ἀσίᾳ Ἱεραπόλεως*

His reference to the Fourth Gospel.

Two extracts from a treatise by Apolinaris *On the Paschal Festival* are preserved in the *Paschal Chronicle*, both of which contain references to the Fourth Gospel. They are quoted by Bishop Lightfoot,[8] whose argument I am here following, and also by Dr. Salmon,[9] but I do not produce them as witnesses, inasmuch as their authenticity, though in the highest degree probable and admitted even by Strauss [1] and Scholten,[2] cannot be considered to have been placed beyond doubt.[3]

Testimony to writings of Melito and Apolinaris, by

The real significance of the evidence of these two bishops arises moreover not from existing fragments but from the extent of their writings, and the impression made by these writings on contemporary and succeeding literature; from the fact that the questions which occupied the anxious thought of the Church, and in which they took a prominent part, were questions which specially concerned Asia Minor and Ephesus, and specially concerned the Fourth Gospel; and from the fact that there is nowhere the slightest hint that in all the width of these volumi-

---

γεγονὼς ἐπίσκοπος. ἤνθησε δὲ ἐπὶ Μάρκου Ἀντωνίνου Βήρου βασιλέως Ῥωμαίων ἀξιόλογος δὲ ὁ ἀνὴρ καὶ φράσει ἀξιολόγῳ κεχρημένος. λέγεται δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἕτερα συγγράμματα ἀξιομνημόνευτα εἶναι, οἷς οὔπω ἡμεῖς ἐνετύχομεν. *Bibliotheca*, cod. 14; ed. Bekker. p. 4.

[8] *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, p. 239.

[9] *Introduction*, ed. 3, p. 264.

[1] *Das Leben Jesu*, 1864, p. 69.

[2] 'Ueber die Echtheit dieser Bruchstücke, die Neander bezweifelte, ist jetzt kein Zwiespalt mehr.' Scholten-Manchot, *Die ältesten Zeugnisse betreffend die Schriften des Neuen Testamentes historisch untersucht*, p. 484.

[3] Cf. Lardner, *Credibility*, part ii. c. 28, 11. Donaldson, *History of Christian Literature*, vol. iii. p. 247.

nous writings, which practically formed the theological encyclopædias of the day, there is any doubt whatever about the reception of the Fourth Gospel in the churches of Asia.

Polycrates,

To Polycrates of Ephesus, Melito is one

> whose walk was entirely guided by the Holy Spirit, who now rests at Sardis waiting for the episcopate from heaven when he shall rise from the dead.[4]

Hippolytus,

Hippolytus asks

> Who is ignorant of the works of Irenæus and Melito and the rest in which Christ is declared to be God and man?[5]

Tertullian,

Jerome quotes Tertullian as saying of him

> that he was reckoned a prophet by most of our people.[6]

Clement,

Clement of Alexandria wrote a treatise on the *Paschal Festival*, which was suggested by Melito's work on the same subject,[7] and the opinion that Melito was himself the Ionian who is included in the list of Clement's teachers[8] cannot be considered to be improbable.

In Carthage, in Ephesus, in Rome, in Alexandria, Melito is then a recognized authority in the Church at the close of the second century. His critical inquiries about the Canon of the Old Testament connect him also with the East, of which he speaks as 'the place where these things were proclaimed and done.'[9]

---

[4] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* v. 24.

[5] *Ibid.* v. 28.

[6] 'Hujus elegans et declamatorium ingenium Tertullianus in septem libris, quos scripsit adversus Ecclesiam pro Montano, cavillatur, dicens eum a plerisque nostrorum Prophetam putari.' *De Viris illustribus*, c. xxiv.; *ut supra*, tom. ii. p. 853-54.

[7] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* iv. 26.

[8] *Ibid.* v. 11.

Anastatius,

To Anastatius of Sinai he is

> the divine and all wise among teachers.[1]

That is, in the monasteries of Sinai as late as the seventh century, the echoes of the second-century judgments are still heard, and Melito is esteemed as a well-known and orthodox Father of the Church.

The reception given to the works of Apolinaris is not less general. We have seen in what light they were regarded by Eusebius, Theodoret, and Photius.

Serapion's letter which is

Serapion, who was bishop of Antioch at the close of the second century, and himself a considerable theological writer, names Apolinaris in a letter which he wrote to Caricus and Ponticus, who were also ecclesiastical writers, in the following terms:—

> But in order that you may see that the influence of this false school of new prophecy, as it is called, has been abhorred by all the brethren in the world, I have sent unto you the writings of Claudius Apolinaris most blessed, who was bishop of Hierapolis in Asia.[2]

subscribed by other bishops,

Eusebius relates that this letter was subscribed also by many other bishops, among them being Aurelius Cyrenius, and Ælius Publius Julius, bishop of Debeltum, a colony of Thrace, in their own hand,[3] so that it becomes a witness on the part of many dioceses to the position and influence of Apolinaris. The witness of Serapion himself is moreover of high value, not only from his date and the honour in which he was held as a bishop and as an author, but also from his care in respect of the Canon, of which we have an example in the fact that he recalled the permission which had been given to the church of Rhossus on the gulf of Issus to read the so-called gospel of Peter.[4]

---

[9] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* iv. 26.

[1] *ὁ θεῖος καὶ πάνσοφος ἐν διδασκάλοις Μελίτων*,—*Ὁδηγός*, *ut supra*, xiii. p. 260.

[2] Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* vi. 12.

[3] *Ibid.* v. 19.

Jerome, Socrates.

Jerome also classes Apolinaris with Melito and others, as a writer who had full knowledge of heathen literature, and used it in refuting heresies,[5] while Socrates places him with Irenæus, Clement, and Serapion, as teaching that our Lord, when He became man, had a human soul.[6]

The general esteem in which both these great Asiatic theologians were held by the churches of Christendom at the close of the second century, and in succeeding generations to whom that second-century history was a living reality, makes it clear what their own position was in relation to the

---

[4] Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* vi. 12.

[5] 'Quid loquar de Melitone Sardensi Episcopo? quid de Apollinario Hierapolitanæ Ecclesiæ Sacerdote, Dionysioque Corinthiorum Episcopo, et Tatiano, et Bardesane, et Irenæo Photini Martyris successore: qui origines hæreseon singularum, et ex quibus Philosophorum fontibus emanarint, multis voluminibus explicarunt?' *Epist.* lxx. *ad Magnum*, *Opera*, ed. Bened. *ut supra*, tom. i. p. 426.

[6] Καὶ γὰρ Εἰρηναῖός τε καὶ Κλήμης, Ἀπολινάριός τε ὁ Ἱεραπολίτης καὶ Σαραπίων ὁ τῆς ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ προεστὼς ἐκκλησίας ἔμψυχον τὸν ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, ἐν τοῖς πονηθεῖσιν αὐτοῖς λόγοις ὡς ὁμολογούμενον αὐτοῖς φάσκουσιν. Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* iii. 7; ed. Hussey, tom. i. p. 398.

Fourth Gospel; while that position is on the other hand a declaration, not only that the churches of Asia, but also that the best scholarship and criticism of the day, accepted the Fourth Gospel as the work of S. John, without even a hint that any other view is possible.[7]

Polycrates of Ephesus, fl. 190. Letter addressed to Victor of Rome.

Polycrates of Ephesus is another witness from the churches of Asia at the close of the second century. A letter was addressed by him in the name of these churches to Victor of Rome, in reply to an inquiry about their practice in keeping Easter, and a large extract from this letter has been preserved in Eusebius. He bases the Asiatic practice, as he tells us, on the teaching of the great luminaries of Asia, Philip of Hierapolis, John of Ephesus, Polycarp of Smyrna, Sagaris of Laodicea, Papirius, and Melito. He was the eighth bishop of his own family, and had been sixty-five years in the Lord; he had studied every Holy Scripture, he had taken counsel with brethren in all parts of the world. The bishops who were assembled with him were a great number, and knew that he did not bear his grey hairs for nought, and that he had always ruled his life by the Lord Jesus.[8] This venerable bishop, writing for himself

His position.

---

[7] On Melito and Apolinaris, cf. generally, Dr. Salmon's articles s.v. in Smith and Wace's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, i. p. 132, iii. p. 894; Bishop Lightfoot, *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, pp. 223 sqq., 237 sqq.; Von Otto, *Corpus*, tom. ix. pp. 374–511; Routh, *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, tom. i. pp. 111–174; and especially the remarkable monograph by Dr. Adolf Harnack, Von Gebhardt und Harnack, *Texte u. Untersuchungen*, Bd. i. pp. 232–282.

[8] Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* v. 24.

His testimony to the Fourth Gospel.

and his episcopal brethren and sons, describes S. John in the exact words of the Gospel, as 'he that leaned on the bosom of the Lord ;'[9] and although we are perhaps not justified in asserting that this is necessarily a reference to the Fourth Gospel,[1] it is natural to believe it to be so, and it is impossible to doubt that this Ephesian bishop was in harmony with 'the great luminaries of Asia' in accepting the Gospel as the work of S. John.

Old Latin and Peshito Versions:

It has been customary to attest the position of the New Testament Canon, and therefore of the Fourth Gospel, in the closing decades of the second century, by the Old Latin and Peshito Syriac Versions, and by the Muratorian Fragment. The

Dr. Liddon's approval of Dr. Westcott's opinions:

Bampton Lecturer for 1866, for example, quotes with approval the opinion of Dr. Westcott, that the Old Latin must have been made before A.D. 170, and that Tertullian's use of it shows,

on the Old Latin,

> that at the end of the century the *Latin translation of St. John's Gospel* had been so generally circulated in Africa, as to have moulded the popular theological dialect.[2]

Few among us will question the high authority—I should certainly be very far from doing so—of the Oxford Lecturer who quotes, or that of the Cambridge Professor who is quoted. The opinion weighed and re-weighed with fulness of knowledge and fairness of judgment during a quarter of a century, has been expressed again quite lately by Dr. Westcott,[3] together with the allied opinion that

---

[9] ἔτι δὲ καὶ Ἰωάννης ὁ ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος τοῦ Κυρίου ἀναπεσὼν, ὃς ἐγενήθη ἱερεὺς τὸ πέταλον πεφορεκὼς, καὶ μάρτυς καὶ διδάσκαλος· οὗτος ἐν Ἐφέσῳ κεκοίμηται. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* v. 24. ἀναπεσὼν ἐκεῖνος οὕτως ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ . . . John xiii. 25. ὃς καὶ ἀνέπεσεν ἐν τῷ δείπνῳ ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος αὐτοῦ . . . John xxi. 20.

[1] But see Bishop Lightfoot, *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, p. 249.

[2] Liddon, *Bampton Lectures*, 1866, ed. 13, 1889, p. 215.

> the Latin translation of Irenæus was probably known to Tertullian,[4]

and the belief that

> Tertullian and the Translator of Irenæus represent respectively the original African and Gallic recensions of the *Vetus Latina*.[5]

on the Peshito,

The same Bampton Lecturer, following the same Cambridge Professor, says of the Peshito Syriac,

> That it was complete then in A.D. 150–160, we may assume without risk of serious error.[6]

And in the latest edition of his work *On the Canon*, published last year, Dr. Westcott has seen

> no sufficient reason to desert the opinion which has obtained the sanction of the most competent scholars, that its formation is to be fixed within the first half of the second century.[7]

on the Muratorian Fragment.

The same high authorities claim in the same way that

> at Rome St. John's Gospel was certainly received as being the work of that Apostle in the year 170. This is clear from the so-termed Muratorian fragment;[8]

---

[3] *On the Canon*, ed. 6, 1889, p. 251.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 256.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 257, note.

[6] *Op. cit.* p. 214, note.

[7] *On the Canon*, *ut supra*, p. 243.

[8] *Bampton Lectures*, *ut supra*, p. 214, based upon Westcott, *On the Canon*, p. 214.

and in 1889, Dr. Westcott again expressed the view that

> The statement in the text of the Fragment is perfectly clear, definite, and consistent with its contents, and there can be no reason either to question its accuracy or to interpret it loosely.[9]

Force of the evidence,

Now, here are witnesses of the first importance ready to our hands, and if these statements about the Versions, and the Fragment of Muratori,[1] with all that would follow from the texts of the Versions and the antecedent conditions of the Fragment, could be established beyond question—and perhaps they will be established—we should be far on the way to render any discussion of the acceptance of the Fourth Gospel in the second century wholly unnecessary. And if I do not deduce from this testimony all that would seem to follow from it, it is not because I am convinced that it is not trustworthy, or that I should in any case venture to assert my own opinion against the opinion of those who believe that it is; but because I cannot claim more than a small fraction of the completeness of knowledge of this subject which ought to be the substructure of a definite statement upon it; and because, as far as I can follow the currents of present criticism, it cannot be regarded as settled beyond question that any known Version of the New Testament or any distinct portion of it, was committed to writing before the close of

if their early date is established.

---

[9] *On the Canon*, *ut supra*, p. 212

[1] But cf. Salmon, *Introduction*, 1888, pp. 46-53.

the second century, or that the Muratorian Fragment is of quite so early a date as that which critics have generally assigned to it. These matters are still before the judgment of experts. For my own part, I should like to await the verdict, which the not-distant future must almost certainly give, without offering any opinion—though I am far from not having one—as to what that verdict will be.

Recent opinions:

Meanwhile, few among the theologians or critics of this century will be regarded as entitled to speak on this question with greater weight than the lamented and revered Bishop Lightfoot and Dr. von Döllinger. One of Bishop Lightfoot's latest articles shows it to be at least probable that the original of the Fragment must have been in Greek verse, and confirms the view that it was almost certainly in the Greek language.[2] Dr. Döllinger was kind enough but a short time before his death, to give me permission to state his opinion on the Fragment in the following terms:—

Bishop Lightfoot,

Dr. von Döllinger.

> I regard it as certain that the Muratorian Fragment is to be placed between A.D. 150 and A.D. 175, and that accordingly the Pastor of Hermas falls in the period from A.D. 130 to about A.D. 150. This is also the prevailing and best supported opinion among German theologians, both Catholic and Protestant.[3]

---

[2] *The Academy*, September 21, 1889, pp. 186 sqq. See also reply by the author of *Supernatural Religion*, in *The Academy*, September 28, p. 205.

[3] 'Ich halte für sicher, dass das Fragm. Muratorianum in die Zeit von 150 bis 175 zu setzen sei, und dass also der Pastor des Hermas in die Zeit von 130 bis etwa 150 falle. Diess ist auch unter den deutschen Theologen beider Confessionen die ueberwiegende und best vortretene Ansicht.' Ign. Doellinger, München, 5 Aug. 1889.

Result independent of these opinions.

But the question which is at present occupying our attention—the reception of the Fourth Gospel towards the close of the second century—will not be seriously affected by any verdict on these points. If it should be proved that the Versions and the Fragment belong to the early years of the third rather than to the closing years of the second century, it will not take from the abundant evidence which we already possess ; and if it should be proved that they belong to the second century, it cannot make more certain that which is quite certain now. And quite certain it is ; for every witness who has been brought before the tribunal of modern criticism has testified to it, every cross-examination has confirmed it, every re-examination has brought out some new point in favour of it. No advocate known in the courts of criticism has ventured to call rebutting evidence. Hilgenfeld and Volkmar, Scholten and Loman, Strauss and Renan, Davidson and the author of *Supernatural Religion*, all admit it ; and there is no more reason to doubt that the Fourth Gospel was known and read as the work of S. John in the closing decades of the second, than that it is so known and read in the closing decades of the nineteenth century.

Summary:

Why then have I taxed your patience with even the outlines of evidence—many who hear me will know how much I have spared you—to prove that which is undoubted ? Partly because the longer a man lives, the more does he learn to take nothing for granted; and the more does he find that the force of the well-known is not always felt, and that references to authorities are not always followed out. But chiefly because the importance of the facts which are admitted, lies not so much in themselves, as in the evidence on which they are based.

Strength of testimony.

Its extent and unanimity.

It is not that the Fourth Gospel was known and read as the work of S. John in the year A.D. 190 or 180 or 170; but that it was known and read through all the extent of Christendom, in churches varying in origin and language and history, in Lyons and Rome, in Carthage and Alexandria, in Athens and Corinth, in Ephesus and Sardis and Hierapolis, in Antioch and Edessa; that the witness is of churches to a sacred book which was read in their services, and about which there could be no mistake, and of individuals who had sacrificed the greatest good of temporal life, and were ready to sacrifice life itself as a witness to its truth; that these individual witnesses were men of culture and rich mental endowment, with full access to materials for judgment, and full power to exercise that judgment; that their witness was given in the face of hostile heathenism and opposing heresy, which demanded caution in argument and reserve in statement; and that this witness is clear, definite, unquestioned.

The corporate

It is not that the Fourth Gospel was known at the end of the second century, but that it was received as divine in churches each of which had a corporate life of the Church.

life and unity, stretching back to the foundation by Apostles and Prophets; and that its chief witnesses are men whose lives bridge wide intervals of place and time. The witness of Irenæus is the product of a life spent in Gaul and Rome and Asia Minor, and extending backwards for threescore years and ten from the close of the second century. For a quarter of a century he was a contemporary of Polycarp, who must have been for a like period a contemporary of S. John. Tertullian's witness is that of a life spent in North Africa and Rome. Clement's witness links together Greece and Italy, the far East and Egypt, and teachers of almost every nation. These writers all claim, in terms which cannot be mistaken, and with a force which cannot be resisted, their unity with those who had preceded them even to Apostolic times.

Answer of author of *Supernatural Religion.*

The author of *Supernatural Religion* in his general reply to criticisms on his work, which he issued as a preface to the sixth edition in 1875, and repeated in the seventh and complete edition in 1879, and again last year, cannot avoid some answer to the question

> how, if no trace of their existence is previously discoverable, the four Gospels are suddenly found in general circulation at the end of the second century, and quoted as authoritative documents by such writers as Irenæus.

He admits the fact in the terms which I have just read, and adds,

> My reply is that it is totally unnecessary for me to account for this. No one acquainted with the history of pseudo-

nymic literature in the second century, and with the rapid circulation and ready acceptance of spurious works tending to edification, could for a moment regard the canonical position of any Gospel at the end of that century either as evidence of its authenticity or early origin. That which concerns us chiefly is not evidence regarding the end of the second but the beginning of the first century. Even if we took the statements of Irenæus and later Fathers, like the Alexandrian Clement, Tertullian and Origen, about the Gospels, they are absolutely without value except as personal opinion at a late date, for which no sufficient grounds are shown. Of the earlier history of those Gospels there is not a distinct trace, except of a nature which altogether discredits them as witnesses for miracles.[4]

Now an author has a perfect right to decide what is necessary and due to his subject and to himself, but if he thinks it totally unnecessary to account for the most important and best established fact in the whole case, and then proceeds to make general remarks which certainly do not account for it, he abandons the judicial inquiry of a critic, and assumes the position of a special pleader for a desperate cause.

Conclusion.

We stand on the banks of a river which we are tracking to its source. We can follow it here by rapid stream, and there by calmer deep, now through fertile plain, and now over mountain rock. Our way is blocked. Beyond is the gloom of an almost impenetrable forest; but here, as it emerges from the forest, our river is broad, full, well defined. What traveller doubts that if he could make a way through the forest he would find the river again ? It is here, and is in strength and volume such as prove it to be far from its source. It must be, it is, yonder.

---

[4] *A Reply to Dr. Lightfoot's Essays*, 1889, p. 43.

It will be our task in the next lecture to follow some of the tracks which have been made in the forest, and see if we come upon our river.

LECTURE II

THE ‘JUDGMENT OF CENTURIES’

THE SECOND CENTURY: EARLIER GENERATIONS

'IT DESERVES LIKEWISE TO BE ATTENDED TO ON THIS SUBJECT, THAT IN A NUMBER OF CONCURRENT TESTIMONIES, (IN CASES WHEREIN THERE COULD HAVE BEEN NO PREVIOUS CONCERT) THERE IS A PROBABILITY DISTINCT FROM THAT WHICH MAY BE TERMED THE SUM OF THE PROBABILITIES RESULTING FROM THE TESTIMONIES OF THE WITNESSES, A PROBABILITY WHICH WOULD REMAIN EVEN THOUGH THE WITNESSES WERE OF SUCH A CHARACTER AS TO MERIT NO FAITH AT ALL. THIS PROBABILITY ARISETH PURELY FROM THE CONCURRENCE ITSELF. THAT SUCH A CONCURRENCE SHOULD SPRING FROM CHANCE, IS AS ONE TO INFINITE; THAT IS, IN OTHER WORDS, MORALLY IMPOSSIBLE. IF THEREFORE CONCERT BE EXCLUDED, THERE REMAINS NO OTHER CAUSE BUT THE REALITY OF THE FACT.'

Principal Campbell.

LECTURE II.

Remember the days of old,
Consider the years of many generations;
Ask thy father, and he will shew thee;
Thine elders, and they will tell thee.
Deut. xxxii. 7.

Evidence of the second century: *The second generation.*

Justin Martyr, fl. 130–160.

FLAVIUS JUSTINUS, philosopher and martyr, is for the middle what Irenæus is for the later decades of the second century, the chief ecclesiastical author and the most important witness for the sacred writings of the Church. We know few details of his life, and these come for the most part from himself. He tells us that he was by descent a Samaritan,[1] but he does not mean by this more than that his ancestors had settled at Flavia Neapolis, a town which had been built near the ruins of Sychem, and is now known as Nablous. The town was named after Flavius Vespasian, and so was Justin himself, and perhaps he belonged to the colony planted there by the emperor after the destruction of Jerusalem. His father's name, Justinus Priscus, was, like his own, Latin; his grandfather's, Bacchius, was Greek.[2] He describes himself as a Gentile, who was uncircumcised and had been trained as a Greek.[3]

---

[1] *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, cap. cxx.; ed. Von Otto, *Corpus*, tom. i. p. 432.

[2] *Apologia*, i. 1; Von Otto, i. 4.

His conversion.

The story of his conversion as told in his own words is familiar, but always interesting, and is for our present inquiry important. It is not Justin only who speaks, as we hear the record of the soul in search for truth at any cost, and telling how he sought it in every creed of philosophy; how he spent a good deal of time with a Stoic, but found that he acquired no full knowledge of God because his agnostic tutor did not know God himself, and therefore did not think such knowledge necessary; how he then tried one who was called a Peripatetic, and was a shrewd fellow in his own opinion, but was after a few days too anxious for his fee, and was therefore in his pupil's opinion no philosopher at all; how, impelled by intense desire, he next tried a very famous Pythagorean, who made a great show of wisdom, and assumed that his hearer would have passed through the preliminary courses of music, astronomy, and geometry, and as soon as he confessed that he knew nothing about them sent him away; how, in his disappointment and helplessness, he thought he would try the Platonists, who had great fame, and was able to do so because a leading Platonist had lately come to live in his city; how he got on rapidly in his studies, and rose by intelligence of incorporeal things, and by contemplation of ideas, as on wings of the mind, until he thought that he was wise, and in his folly expected at once to attain the end of philosophy, the vision of God; how one day, in a field not far from the sea, chosen as fitting for his contemplative walk, he met an old man, rather striking in appearance, gentle and grave in manner, who entered into conversation with him, and led him step by step as in a Platonic dialogue, to doubt all human wisdom; how, since he was unable himself to resist the questions closing around him, he endeavoured to shield himself behind authority, and asked whether these things had escaped the wisdom of Plato and Pythagoras, who were as a wall and fortress of philosophy; how he received the answer that truth is independent of what these or any men have held, that long before any philosophers there existed prophets who did not demonstrate truths but witnessed to them, being filled by the Holy Spirit, and speaking the things which they saw and heard; how, after telling him these and other things, the old man left him alone, and bade him think of them; and how a flame was forthwith kindled in his soul, and he found this philosophy alone to be profitable and safe.[4]

---

[3] *Apol.* i. 53; Von Otto, i. pp. 142–4. *Dial.* capp. ii. and xxix.; *ibid.* i. pp. 6 sqq., and 96–8.

His ethics of opinion.

Such was the training of our present witness. Here is his view of the ethics of opinion:—

> Reason dictates that men who are indeed good and worthy to be called philosophers, should give honour and regard only to the true, refusing to follow the opinions of those who have gone before, if these opinions are worthless. The same sound reason dictates also, that we should not

---

[4] *Dial.* capp. ii.–viii.; Von Otto, i. pp. 6–34.

follow those who have done or taught anything wrong; but that a lover of truth must by all means, even if it be at the cost of life, and in the very presence of death, choose both to say and do the right.[5]

That in this statement we have no mere form of words, but the convictions of a true man, the term Martyr, which has been always associated with Justin, will serve to remind us.

His writings.

Justin was a voluminous writer, and not a few works which bear internal evidence of a later date have claimed the support of his name. Men who are attracted by the microscopic investigations of the sixteenth or seventeenth, as well as of the nineteenth century, will find here an abundant field for them which has been by no means neglected; but there is now little disagreement among scholars of the most opposed general positions, as to the genuine writings of Justin. The two *Apologies* and the *Dialogue with Trypho* are his; more than this cannot be said with confidence. The Second *Apology*, which consists of only a few pages, is not free from difficulties, but it has no connexion with the present question, and they need not be considered here. The First *Apology* and the *Dialogue* are documents of primary importance.

Chronology not accurately known.

The chronology of Justin's life, and the dates of his writings, have not been, perhaps cannot be, accurately established, and with our present knowledge we must remain content with approximations; but it is admitted that this imperfection has no practical effect on the evidence. Credner, of whom his pupil and editor, Dr. Volkmar, speaks with hardly too great confidence when he predicts that 'his name will remain honoured as long as the science of Introduction to the New Testament shall exist,'[6] places in his chief and, alas, posthumous work, the writings of Justin soon after A.D. 130, and his death soon after A.D. 166.[7] Volkmar, in a note to this passage, naturally calls attention to later investigations of his own,[8] by which the possible limits of the writings had been narrowed from A.D. 130–166 to A.D. 140–150, but adds that this does not affect the result. You will remember that both Credner and Volkmar represent distinctly liberal and negative lines of thought. Side by side with Volkmar, and indeed earlier—for the main conclusions of the article were worked out in 1852, though it was not published until 1857—Dr. Hort had been making independent inquiries, which issued in results that were consistent with Volkmar's, but gave still narrower limits.[9] The chief difference in the course of the investigations consists in the fact that Dr. Hort accepts, and Volkmar does not accept, the evidence of Epiphanius about Tatian.[1] This gives 'A.D. 149 or 150 as the

---

[5] *Apol.* i. 2; Von Otto, i. pp. 6–8.

Opinions of: Credner,

Volkmar,

Dr. Hort.

---

[6] *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanon*, 1860, Vorwort, Dec. 1858.

[7] *Ibid.* § 3. p. 5.

[8] *Theologische Jahrbücher*, 1855, pp. 227 sqq. and 412 sqq.

[9] *Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology*, iii. pp. 155–193.

[1] *Ibid.* p. 156. Epiphanius, *Panaria*, i. 391; ed. Oehler, *Corpus*, ii. pp. 708 sqq.

posterior, or rather post-posterior, limit of Justin's life;' and Dr. Hort concludes that

> We may without fear of considerable errour set down Justin's first Apology to 145 or better still to 146, and his death to 148. The second Apology, if really separate from the first, will then fall in 146 or 147, and the Dialogue with Tryphon about the same time.[2]

This is practically a return to the older position of Pearson, who was followed by Dodwell, Massuet, and others. Modern critics had, for the most part, given considerable weight to the absence of the title Cæsar from the names of Marcus Aurelius (Verissimus Philosophus) and Lucius Verus (Lucius Philosophus) in the dedication of the First *Apology*, and had concluded that it could not have been written after their adoption by Antoninus Pius in July A.D. 138. The earlier date, A.D. 138 or 139, has the high authority of M. Waddington,[3] and is also accepted by, among others, Dr. Caspari of Christiania,[4] and Dr. Adolf Harnack.[5]

The First *Apology*,

The position of Justin is a key-stone in the ecclesiastical history of the second century, and you will feel therefore that some details of his date are essential to our purpose, but it is unnecessary to enter at any greater length on a discussion which is after all chiefly of literary interest,[6] and, as we have been reminded and the *Dialogue*, c.138-150.

---

[2] *Journal, ut supra*, p. 191.

[3] *Mémoire de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-lettres*, 1867, tom. xxvi. pt. i. pp. 264 sqq.

[4] *Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols und der Glaubensregel*, Thl. iii. 1875, pp. 362 sqq.

[5] *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1876, No. 1, col. 14.

[6] 'Au reste, c'est là une

by Dr. Volkmar, does not really affect the result. As far as the writings with which we shall have to deal are concerned, that is, the First *Apology* and the *Dialogue*, we have a consensus of opinion that they fall within the ten or twelve years from A.D. 138 to A.D. 148 or 150. It will not escape your attention that every year by which they are shifted backwards increases their importance as early evidence, while every year by which they are pressed forwards welds more closely the essential unity of Justin and Irenæus as witnesses for the use of the Gospels.

The period included in the composition of the *Dialogue* itself, probably covers at least the dozen years which have just been marked out as our limits. It must have been written before the First *Apology*, for this work contains a distinct reference to it;[7] but in the first chapter of the *Dialogue*, Trypho describes himself as a fugitive from the war,[8] and in the ninth chapter, when Trypho's friends fall into conversation among themselves, the natural subject is the war in Judæa. We may suppose therefore that the *Dialogue* took place at no great interval after the insurrection of Bar-Kochba, that is, not much later than A.D. 135. Justin intimates in the course of the discussion,[9] that it is his intention to draw

---

question de pure curiosité littéraire.' Aubé, *Saint Justin*, p. 39.

[7] *Dial.* cap. cxx. *ad fin.*; Von Otto, i. p. 432. Cf. *Apol.* cap. xxvi.; *ibid.* i. pp. 76 sqq.

[8] Too much stress must not be laid on the expression τὸν νῦν γενόμενον πόλεμον. Cf. *Apol.* i. cap. xxxi.; *ibid.* p. 94, note 8.

[9] *Dial.* cap. lxxx.; *ibid.* pp. 286 sqq.

up a statement of the arguments on either side, and early in the *Dialogue*[1] addresses an unknown friend who is disclosed at the end as Marcus Pompeius,[2] for whose benefit the account of the discussion seems to have been written some years after it actually took place. How far the account is strictly historical, and how far it has been cast by the writer into its present shape after the fashion of a dialogue of Plato; whether Trypho is really the renowned Rabbi Tarphon,[3] whether portions of the *Dialogue* have been lost, are questions which need not here concern us.[4] Our witness is Justin, and the evidence is not affected by the doubt whether Justin or Trypho really said certain things in a certain definite form about A.D. 135, or whether Justin, writing some years later, describes them as saying these things at that time. Justin's representation of the position in which the interlocutors stood towards the Gospels, would be his own testimony to the position of the Gospels at the time when the *Dialogue* took place. A dramatist of contemporaneous events does not introduce anachronisms.

---

[1] *Dial.* cap. viii.; Von Otto, pp. 32 sqq.

[2] *Ibid.* cap. cxli. *ad fin.*; *ibid.* p. 496.

[3] 'טרפון *Tarphon*, ut Judæi pronunciant, sive ut *Carpzovius* in Introd. ad Theol. Jud. p. 84, mavult, *Truphon*, vel potius *Tryphon*, quod nominis in Oriente, Syria inprimis et Ægypto usitatissimum fuisse ex Scaligeri Animadverss. ad Euseb. p. 146, et *Ezech. Spanhemio* de Usu et præstantia Numism. p. 454, observat *Relandus* ad Othonem p. 131. . . . Disputatur alioquin inter eruditos, noster ne Tryphon cum Judæo illo, contra quem *Justinus Martyr* disputat in dialogo, idem sit, an minus. Affirmant id *Bartoloccius* Parte II. p. 862, *Drusius* de Sectis Judæorum lib. II. c. ii. (8), *Jo. Lightfootus* tom. ii. Opp. p. 144, *Relandus* ad Othonem, p. 129, *Cavius* in Histor. Liter. p. 28 et alii, qui de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis exposuerunt: ex nostratibus autem *Carpzovius* l. c. Sententiæ huic applauserunt plerique, quia inprimis temporis ratio eam commendare videbatur. Tryphon enim hic a Judæis Akibæ statuitur æqualis, Akibæ scilicet illius, qui princeps rebellionis Judaicæ, Coziba Pseudo Messia præeunte, in urbe Bitter excitatæ, pars fuit, et in isto bello vitam finiit secundum Judæos A.M. 3880, vel 3901, i.e. A.C. 120, vel 141.' Wolf, *Bibliothecæ Hebrææ*, part ii. 1721, pp. 836–7.

[4] See esp. Zahn, *Studien zur Justin* in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 1886, pp. 1–84.

Their evidence to use of the Fourth Gospel.

What then is the evidence of Justin, as furnished by his First *Apology* and the *Dialogue with Trypho*, to the existence and use of the Fourth Gospel in the fourth and fifth decades of the second century? What traces have we a right to expect in these writings, on the assumption that the work was then known and accepted, and what traces do we as a matter of fact find?

Nature of an apology.

It will not be forgotten that the *Apology* is a short defence of Christians, addressed to the emperor, senate, and people of Rome. It is not a treatise on doctrine for the use of Christians, nor yet a declaration of the truths held by the Church in opposition to the perversions of heresy. It will not be expected therefore to contain full and clear statements, such as are found in the great work of Irenæus *Against Heresies*; nor would those to whom it was addressed care much about the Christian writings. The question for them was the nature of Christianity itself, and its relation to the empire. The writer of the *Apology* would limit himself to such materials as would serve the purpose in hand, and would keep before the mind his august but heathen readers. He had himself been a heathen, and had been largely influenced in accepting the truth of Christianity by the fulfilment of Hebrew prophecy, and the moral elevation of Christians. On both of these he will naturally dwell in addressing other heathen.

The *Dialogue* an apology addressed to Jews.

The *Dialogue with Trypho* is, in like manner, an apology for Christianity addressed to the Jews; but Trypho would not admit the authority of the Gospels any more than a heathen emperor would. For him the Old Testament is the book of oracles, and to this the appeal is therefore constantly made. To no writing of the New Testament can there be any such appeal. The facts of the Gospel history are referred to as facts, and they are not disputed; but Justin cannot claim any special value for them, nor would Trypho grant any such claim on the ground that they were related by inspired authors, or were contained in documents of more than human authority.

Position of an apologist in the second century:

An apologist of the second century cannot moreover, from his very position, refer to books which he himself considers to be sacred, as inspired or authoritative. This would be to beg the question at issue. Nor would the names of the writers give any weight to statements which might be quoted from them. On the contrary, to omit the names of the sacred writers, and to avoid all reference to their writings, may be taken as the normal use in apologetic treatises of this period, by men whose other works show a familiar acquaintance with them.

This will appear from two or three examples. Justin's own pupil Tatian was, as we shall have occasion to see presently, the compiler of a harmony of the four Gospels. He also wrote an apologetic *Discourse to Greeks*,[5] which nowhere refers by name to any sacred writing or any author of such writing. Athenagoras presented an *Apology*[6] to Marcus Aurelius in the last quarter of the century, when there was no question as to the Gospels, but he makes no reference by name to them or to their authors. Tertullian constantly refers to the Gospels and their writers in his other works; but if we stood to Tertullian in a similar position to that in which we stand to Justin—that is, if only his *Apology*[7] and address *To the Gentiles*,[8] were extant—we should have no proof that he had any knowledge either of the Gospels or of their writers. Cyprian, to whom the Gospels were as familiar as they are to ourselves, in his address to Demetrian nowhere names the Gospels or the Evangelists. He quotes the New Testament writings, and in three instances quotes the Gospels; but Lactantius is of opinion that even this is a wrong method of treatment, for Demetrian was in his view 'not to be confuted by authorities from that scripture which he regarded as false and fabricated, but by arguments and reason.'[9] It is not, therefore, a mark

Tatian,

Athenagoras,

Tertullian,

Cyprian.

---

[5] *Oratio ad Græcos.* Von Otto, *Corpus*, tom. vi.

[6] *Supplicatio pro Christianis. Ibid.* tom. vii.

[7] *Apologeticum*, ed. Oehler, tom. i.

[8] *Ad Nationes. Ibid.*

[9] Lactantius, *Institut.* lib. v. § 4. Norton, *Genuineness of the Gospels*, ed. 2, pp. 137 sq.

of higher knowledge, but of ignorance, to seek verbal quotations in apologists of the second century.

Direct reference to Evangelists not to be expected.

To expect then in these writings of Justin any formal claim to inspiration or Apostolic authority for the Gospels, or any reference by name to the Evangelists, is to ignore the essential conditions under which they were written ; to expect that, in works in which fulfilment of prophecy is the central idea, the subject-matter of the Fourth Gospel should be as prominent as that of S. Matthew, or that, in works in which the outlines of our Lord's teaching are necessarily to be presented in their simplest form, the deeper teaching of the Fourth Gospel should be as prominent as the Sermon on the Mount, is to fail wholly in the historic imagination, which is a first requisite to the understanding what these apologies really were ; and to expect that quotations from the Gospels should be made by Justin with minute and verbal conformity to the text of any one Gospel, is to demand from him what is found in no ante-Nicene Father, and is much less frequent in writers of every age than is generally supposed to be the case. A smile of contempt has not seldom been indulged in at the expense of simple Christian folk who have sometimes spoken as though, at the close of the first and in the earlier years of the second century, the whole New Testament was collected into a volume of convenient size, and was in this form widely circulated throughout Christendom. But the demand for quotations, as it is often formulated, implies such a volume with chapters and verses, or at least some collection with simple methods of division and reference; and it cannot possibly be satisfied by the condition of things which existed at that time.

Traces of Fourth Gospel in Justin.

Let us turn then to the pages of Justin, with a correct impression of what may fairly be expected, and see what traces of the Fourth Gospel are actually found there. If our limits will allow us to make only a brief examination of a very wide subject, it will be a satisfaction to remember that in the present state of modern criticism, a detailed treatment of this point is less necessary than that of some others.

Recurrence of term ***Memoirs*****:**

Now, one of the first things which strike the student of Justin is the recurrence of the term *Memoirs of the Apostles*, which, with some variations, is found alike throughout the *Apology* and the *Dialogue*. We find the term now in the simplest form:—

The Memoirs**,**

. . . it is written in the Memoirs.[1]

Again, we have 'Memoirs of the Apostles':—

Memoirs of the Apostles**,**

. . . the Apostles in the memoirs composed by them which are called Gospels . . .[2]

And upon the day called Sunday all who live either in town or country meet together at one place, and the memoirs

---

[1] ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασι γέγραπται· *Dial.* cap. cv. *ad fin.*, quoting Matt. v. 20. Von Otto, *Corpus*, i. p. 378. γέγραπται ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, cap. cvii. *ad init.*, quoting Matt. xvi. 1, 4, cf. xii. 39. *Ibid.* i. 382.

[2] Οἱ γὰρ ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια, *Apol.* i. cap. lxvi. Then follows the Eucharistic formula from Luke xxii. 19; cf. Matt. xxvi. 28. *Ibid.* i. 182.

> of the Apostles and the writings of the prophets are read as long as time permits.[3]
>
> For this devil . . . is said in the memoirs of the Apostles to have drawn near to Him, and to have tempted Him.[4]

Memoirs of His Apostles,

Then again we have the form 'Memoirs of His Apostles,' where 'His' distinctly refers to our Lord:—

> . . . we find it recorded in the memoirs of His Apostles that He is the Son of God.[5]
>
> . . . which things are also written in the memoirs of His Apostles.[6]
>
> . . . as has been shown in the memoirs of His Apostles.[7]
>
> . . . which things indeed are reported to have happened in the memoirs of His Apostles.[8]

his Memoirs.

Then the form 'his Memoirs':—

> It is said that one of the Apostles was called Peter after his name was changed, and this is recorded in his memoirs— [9]

where 'his memoirs' may mean the 'memoirs of Peter,' *i.e.* the Gospel of Mark, where the change of name is recorded, or the 'memoirs of Christ;' but neither usage has any parallel in Justin, and there is every reason to think with Von Otto that the reading is wrong, and that the word 'his' should be 'their,' referring to the preceding 'Apostles,' or, better still, that 'Apostles' has dropped out. With this emendation it becomes another instance of 'memoirs of His Apostles,' forms of which we have just noted in this immediate context.

---

[3] Καὶ τῇ τοῦ Ἡλίου λεγομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ πάντων κατὰ πόλεις ἢ ἀγροὺς μενόντων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέλευσις γίνεται, καὶ τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων ἢ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν ἀναγινώσκεται μέχρις ἐγχωρεῖ. *Apol.* i. cap. lxvii. ; Von Otto, i. 184–186.

[4] ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασι τῶν ἀποστόλων γέγραπται προσελθὼν αὐτῷ καὶ πειράζων μέχρι τοῦ εἰπεῖν αὐτῷ· Then follows a citation from Matt. iv. 9, 10. *Dial.* cap. ciii. ; *ibid.* i. 372. Cf. another reference to this chapter *infra.*

[5] ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασι τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ. *Dial.* cap. c. ; *ibid.* i. 356.

[6] *Dial.* cap. ci. *ad fin.*, The mockery on the cross, Ps. xxii. *Ibid.* i. 362.

[7] *Dial.* cap. cii., The silence before Pilate. *Ibid.* i. 364.

[8] *Dial.* cap. civ., The prophecies of Ps. xxii. 15–18. *Ibid.* i. 374.

[9] Καὶ τὸ εἰπεῖν μετωνομακέναι αὐτὸν Πέτρον ἕνα τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ γεγράφθαι ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν αὐτοῦ . . . *Dial.* cap. cvi., Mark iii. 16, 17 ; *ibid.* i. 380. See esp. Von Otto's note 10 *in loc.*

Memoirs further described:

The *Memoirs* are further described in two important passages:—

> They who have written memoirs of all things which relate to our Lord Jesus Christ . . .[1]
>
> In the memoirs which I say were composed by His Apostles and those who followed them . . .[2]

considered as, a written record of the Lord,

The first reflection which will occur on examining these quotations is, I think, that Justin regards the *Memoirs* as a whole, and that he regards them as an authoritative written record of the life of our Lord. To them, and to them only, is the appeal made. They are 'memoirs of all things which relate to our Lord Jesus Christ.'

sacred books,

The description of the Sunday service, moreover, shows that the *Memoirs* are regarded as sacred books. They are read—and it is clear from the context that a general use is referred to, not that of any particular church—together with the writings of the Prophets.

---

[1] ὥς οἱ ἀπομνημονεύσαντες πάντα τὰ περὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐδίδαξαν, . . . *Apol.* i. cap. xxxiii., where the corresponding verb is used; *ibid.* i. 102.

[2] Ἐν γὰρ τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἅ φημι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐκείνοις παρακολουθησάντων συντετάχθαι, . . . *Dial.* cap. ciii.; *ibid.* i. 372.

They are placed in order before the writings of the Prophets, and had obtained therefore the position of first in honour and importance. It will not escape notice, though the line of thought must not now be followed, that this position of the *Memoirs* carries any possible date which can be assigned to them, to a time long before that of which Justin is speaking.

of Apostolic authority,

Another obvious reflection is, that in Justin's thought there lies behind these *Memoirs* the authority of the Apostles. They are to him not only 'memoirs,' but 'memoirs of the Apostles.' And behind the Apostles there lies the authority of the Lord. They are not only 'memoirs of the Apostles,' but 'memoirs of His Apostles,' 'memoirs composed by His Apostles, and those who followed them.' The student will find that the successive steps by which all teaching is traced through the Apostles to the Lord Himself are quite as certain, if not quite so definitely expressed, as they are in the passages of Tertullian which were quoted in the last lecture.[3] He will need therefore no guidance to an answer, if he should meet with the assertion that Justin derived any part of his doctrine from human teachers, as, for example, the doctrine of the Logos from the pages of Philo; no guidance, I mean, other than the pages of Justin himself.

coming from the Lord.

Use by Tertullian,

This reference to Tertullian brings another thought in its train. We know what Gospels he used, and how he traced them back in the unity of

---

[3] Lecture I. pp. 24 sqq.

Irenæus, and others.

the Church's life and teaching to the Lord Himself. We know, too, what language Irenæus used about the four-fold Gospel, and the Gospel according to S. John, and we remember that Tertullian is a witness from Rome, and that Irenæus is a witness from Ephesus and Rome as well as from Lyons. But Ephesus is the scene of the *Dialogue with Trypho*, and Rome is the place where both the *Apology* and the *Dialogue* were written. And Irenæus was for a quarter of a century a contemporary of Justin, and probably at one time a fellow-citizen with him in Rome. In any case he was in immediate contact with his life and work, and had a full and exact knowledge of his writings; for in the work of Irenæus *Against Heresies*, the *Apology* and *Dialogue* are quoted or referred to at least thirty times.[4] Tertullian's references to Justin are known to be still more full, and his works were used also by Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Minucius Felix, Melito.[5]

The works of Justin are then in familiar use by his contemporaries and followers. For the most prominent of these writers, the four Gospels stand out as clearly as they do for Origen or Eusebius. Is it, therefore, within any possible limits of even an unbeliever's credulity, that Irenæus should be minutely acquainted with Justin, should know all

---

[4] Cf. *Adv. Hær.* iv. 6. 2, *καὶ καλῶς Ἰουστῖνος ἐν τῷ πρὸς Μαρκίωνα συντάγματι φησίν*, and v. 26. 2, *καλῶς ὁ Ἰουστῖνος ἔφη.* Ed. Harvey, tom. ii. pp. 158 and 396. See the list in Von Otto's Index iv. *Corpus*, tom. ii. pp. 595–6; and Von Gebhardt und Hurnack, *Texte und Untersuchungen*, Bd. i. p. 131.

[5] See Von Otto, *ut supra*.

Identified therefore with the four Gospels.

about the *Memoirs of the Apostles*, the *Memoirs of His Apostles*, the *Memoirs composed by them which are called Gospels*, the *Memoirs which are read on the day called Sunday*, the *Memoirs which were composed by His Apostles and those who followed them*, the *Memoirs of all things which relate to our Lord Jesus Christ*, and should, without one word to indicate the change, write all that he does write about the four-fold Gospel and S. John, unless he himself believed, and meant his readers to believe, that the four Gospels are identical with the *Memoirs* of which Justin speaks so much, and that the Gospel according to S. John was widely read with the others in Church services between the years A.D. 130–140 ? I will not waste time by asking a similar question about Tertullian, because I have already with some fulness quoted his language,[6] and that language read in the light of his use of Justin, and of his connexion with Rome, leaves no possible room for doubt. Nor will I seek to answer questions which have sometimes been asked about the interval between Justin and Irenæus, because in the truest sense there was no such interval. Corporations do not die. The corporate life of the Church flows ever on.

This proved by Tatian's *Diatessaron.*

But one visible link is so striking that it must not be passed over. Tatian's relation to modern criticism will meet us again,[7] but the great fact which seems to be now established beyond question, that Tatian, the pupil of Justin, composed a harmony—a *Diatessaron*—of four Gospels, which are practically identical with our own, is, apart from every other consideration, sufficient to show what writings were included under the term, *Memoirs of the Apostles.* The *Diatessaron* of Tatian is the key to the *Memoirs* of Justin.

---

[6] Cf. Lecture I. pp. 24 sqq.

[7] Cf. Lecture VII. pp. 375 sqq.

The identification is made by Justin,

In one of the passages which I have quoted[8] from the *Apology*, Justin himself identifies the *Memoirs* with the Gospels—'the Memoirs . . . which are called Gospels.'[9] Some attempts have been made to invalidate the force of this identification by supposing the words to be a gloss; but there is no MS. authority for doubting their genuineness,[1] and they are quite in accord with Justin's usage. In the *Dialogue*, a passage which is apparently quoted from S. Matthew is referred to as 'written in the Gospel;'[2] and in another place Trypho speaks of the Christian precepts which are contained 'in the so-called Gospel.'[3] The fact seems to be that Trypho is acquainted with one or more of the individual writings which collectively formed the 'Gospel,' their use as lessons being probably the bridge by which the term passed from the good news which the writings contained, to the writings themselves, and to him, as a student of them, Justin uses the term *Gospel*; while in other portions of the *Dialogue*, in the presence of Trypho's friends, he uses the term *Memoirs*. But in the *Apology*, the regular term for the outside world is *Memoirs*, which in this instance he identifies with the *Gospels* of the inner Christian circle. In the same way he explains 'Baptism'[3]—the word itself not occurring in the *Apology*, though not infrequent in the *Dialogue*—'Eucharist,'[4] 'Christos,'[5] and the technical use of 'brethren.'[6]

---

[8] Cf. *supra*, p. 65.

[9] *Apol.* i. cap. lxvi.; Von Otto, *Corpus*, i. 182.

[1] 'Forte sunt qui audacter illa verba expungerent ac sibi gratularentur de emendatione. Sane Schleiermachero (*Einl. ins N. T.* Ber. 1845, p. 71) glossam videntur olere. Verum nihil muto.' Von Otto, *in loc.* note 5.

[2] *Dial.* cap. c.; Von Otto, i. p. 356; Matt. xi. 27. Cf. Luke x. 22.

[3] *Dial.* cap. x.; *ibid.* p. 38.

and known to Irenæus, and others.

Irenæus,[7] and Tertullian, when they wrote so much about the *Gospels*, and used so fully this *Apology* of Justin's, were perfectly aware that while he employed the term *Memoirs* in addressing outsiders, he and other Christians used the term *Gospels*, or, to express the unity of a collected plurality, *Gospel*; and that he formally asserted the two sets of writings to be identical. The *Gospels* of Irenæus and Tertullian are thus further identified with the *Memoirs* of Justin.

Fourth Gospel certainly included in the *Memoirs*.

If these general statements are accepted, there remains no question about Justin's use of the Fourth Gospel. It is included in the *Memoirs*, which were read in the services of the Church. It would seem then to be an idle task to inquire whether in this short *Apology* to Gentiles, for whom the elementary terms of the Christian life have to be explained, there are any references to the most spiritual representation of the doctrine of Christ; or whether in this *Dialogue* with an ideal Jew, his attention will be formally directed to the writing which, more than any other, had tolled the knell of an exclusive Judaism. The task, moreover, has been very adequately performed by others, as we shall see, and my own special duty in these lectures is to estimate modern criticism, not to add to it.

---

[3] *Apol.* i. cap. lxi.; Von Otto, *Corpus*, pp. 162 sqq.

[4] *Apol.* cap. lxvi.; *ibid.* p. 180–182.

[5] *Apol.* cap. xxx.; *ibid.* p. 90.

[6] *Apol.* cap. lxv.; *ibid.* p. 176–180.

[7] Cf. Zahn, *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons*, 1889, Bd. i. 2 Hälfte, p. 467.

Recent investigations:

I will therefore pass over a somewhat full examination of the pages of Justin, which I had myself made for this purpose, and that the more gladly as a minute comparison of texts is not easily presented in a 'sermon-lecture,' and will ask you to consider some results of the more recent critical investigations of this question. Part of them will be thought by some persons whom my words may reach to be much more authoritative than any induction which could be made by a Bampton Lecturer.

Herr Albrecht Thoma,

Herr Albrecht Thoma is one of the ablest opponents of the view that S. John wrote the Fourth Gospel. In the year 1875 he discussed in two long and important articles in *Hilgenfeld's Review*, the relation of Justin to Paul and the John-Gospel.[8] The article devoted to S. John occupies seventy-five closely-printed pages, and includes a detailed examination of every chapter. The writer is not convinced that S. John is included in the *Memoirs*—he does not approach this question, as we have done, from the side of history—nor yet that he is quoted as an authoritative historical source ; but taking chapter by chapter, and verse by verse, he finds what he calls a 'literary community of goods'[9] which leaves, in his opinion, no room for doubt that Justin knew and used S. John. To adopt Herr Thoma's own expressive phrase :—

---

[8] *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1875, xix. pp. 490–565.

> He cites the Synoptists, he thinks and argues according to John.[1]

Again :—

> John is to the Martyr no historic writing in the sense of the Synoptists. It is to him no book of history, but much more a manual from which he draws precious materials for his Christology.[2]

Again :—

> The Fourth Gospel is to Justin in a similar position to that of the Epistles [of S. Paul].[3]

The final conclusion is that :—

> As a manual of Christian gnosis, but not as a source of historical knowledge, it may after all be called a 'Gospel,' and we may place it among the Gospels.[4]

---

[9] 'Eine literarische Gütergemeinschaft.' *Zeitschrift, ut supra*, p. 545.

[1] 'Die Synoptiker citirt er, nach Johannes denkt und argumentirt er.' *Ibid.* p. 554.

[2] 'Johannes ist dem Märtyrer keine historische Schrift im Sinne der Synoptiker, kein Geschichtsbuch, er ist ihm vielmehr ein Lehrbuch, aus dem er schätzbares Material für seine Christologie herausholt.' *Ibid.* pp. 557, 558.

[3] 'Das vierte Evangelium steht Justin auf gleicher Linie, wie die Episteln.' *Ibid.* p. 558.

[4] 'Als Lehrbuch der christlichen Gnosis, aber nicht als Quelle geschichtlicher Erkenntniss, mag man's auch immerhin ein "Evangelium" nennen und unter die Evangelien stellen.' *Ibid.* p. 565.

Dr. Adolf Hilgenfeld is probably the best known living representative of the negative Tübingen school, and his *Review*, from which I have just quoted, took the place of Baur and Zeller's *Tübingen Year-book*, and has been for more than thirty years the leading exponent of what has been considered to be advanced teaching. In 1875 he published a critical and learned *Introduction to the New Testament*, in which he sums up the results of his previous studies. In this work he admits the difficulty of denying Justin's use of the Fourth Gospel, and adds :—

Dr. Adolf Hilgenfeld,

> I have long recognized the possibility of Justin's acquaintance with the John-Gospel.[5] . . .

Dr. Ezra Abbot, an American divine, whose too early death in 1884 was regarded on both sides of the Atlantic as a severe loss to the science of criticism, published in 1880 a work on the *Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*,[6] which was republished last year, in a volume of Dr. Abbot's collected papers. Nearly all subsequent writers on the subject have acknowledged their indebtedness to this essay. Perhaps no other portion of it is so valuable as that in which, with all the microscopic exactness and care of a laboratory, he analyses, examines, and weighs the quotations in Justin. This is how he states the results of his examination :—

Dr. Ezra Abbot,

> We are authorized then, I believe, to regard it as in the highest degree probable, if not morally certain, that in the

---

[5] *Historisch-kritische Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 1875, p. 67.

[6] *Authorship of the Fourth Gospel. External Evidences.* 1880.

time of Justin Martyr the Fourth Gospel was generally received as the work of the Apostle John.[7]

It will add to the value of these results in the opinion of some persons, if they are reminded that Dr. Ezra Abbot was a professor in the University of Harvard, and that this essay was first read before the Ministers' Institute, and was first printed in the *Unitarian Review*.

Professor James Drummond,

On this side of the Atlantic we have been not less indebted on many questions connected with the Fourth Gospel to the patient investigations of a learned Unitarian minister. Professor James Drummond has the honour of being one of the few English theologians who are stated, in an article which has attained some celebrity,[8] to be in the van of modern progress. He has the much higher honour of worthily filling an office which was made great by the intellectual and moral stature of Dr. James Martineau. Professor Drummond discussed the relation of Justin to the Fourth Gospel in three articles in an English Unitarian quarterly, *The Theological Review*, in October 1875,[9] and in April and July 1877.[1] Dr. Ezra Abbot has expressed what is, I believe, the general estimate of these articles, in the following words which he applied to the first of the series :—

---

[7] *Authorship, ut supra*, p. 80.

[8] Mrs. Humphry Ward, *The New Reformation: Nineteenth Century*, March 1889, p. 468, note.

[9] *Theological Review*, vol. xii. pp. 471–488.

[1] *Ibid.* vol. xiv. pp. 155, 323. Cf. also Prof. Drummond's interesting review of Von Engelhardt's *Das Christenthum Justin's des Märtyrers*. *Ibid.* vol. xvi. pp. 365 sqq.

> He has treated the question with the ability, candor, and cautious accuracy of statement which distinguish his writings generally.[2]

The evidence of Professor Drummond as a witness should have therefore exceptional weight in determining our opinion. It is expressed in language which is clear and definite :—

> It does seem to me surprising that anyone, in comparing the passages in Justin and John, should doubt for one moment that the dependence is on the side of the former. John has all the impress of original genius, and gives his thoughts with the terse suggestiveness of one who for the first time commits them to writing. Justin never rises above the level of a prosy interpreter of other people's ideas.[3]

On another page he says :—

> There are two hypotheses by which to account for the quotation in Justin :[4] (1) that a Gospel which in the generation after Justin was, as we know, confidently believed to have been in existence for the greater part of a century, was really in existence sufficiently early to be used by Justin; and (2) that a Gospel with a precisely similar vein of thought, a Gospel which in the generation after Justin had passed out of ecclesiastical use, and the very existence of which is merely inferred from the present quotation, was cited by Justin as an apostolical authority. The latter hypothesis, being framed for the express purpose, will of course explain the phenomenon. If the reasoning in this paper be correct, the former hypothesis, framed not for the purpose, but on the ground

---

[2] *Authorship*, *ut supra*, p. 34, note.

[3] *Review*, *ut supra*, vol. xii. p. 483.

[4] 'Apol. i. c. 61,' quoting John iii. 3–5. Cf. Von Otto, *Corpus*, i. pp. 164–166.

> of historic probability, also affords an adequate explanation of the facts. Surely, then, it is the part of sound criticism to accept an explanation which is founded upon what we *know*, instead of resorting to the boundless field of *conjecture*, where the severity of scientific study is in danger of being sacrificed to the facile pleasure of piling up shifting and unsubstantial hypotheses.[5]

And he sums up the results of the last article as follows:—

> I must conclude, therefore, as best satisfying on the whole the conditions of the case, not only that Justin regarded the fourth Gospel as one of the historical Memoirs of Christ, but that it is not improbable that he believed in its Johannine authorship. This is a very old-fashioned conclusion; but I have endeavoured simply to follow the evidence without any ulterior object, and must leave the result to the judgment of the reader.[6]

Dr. Sanday,

The writer of the article in the *Nineteenth Century* to which I just now referred, singled out our present Professor of Exegesis as another of the few English thinkers whose work was worthy of being classed with that of modern Germans. I agree so fully at least in the inclusive part of this opinion, that I will quote Dr. Sanday's judgment on Justin's relation to S. John. And first from his work on the *Gospels in the Second Century*:—

his view in 1876,

> 'The word became flesh,' is the key by which Justin is made intelligible, and that key is supplied by the fourth Gospel. No other Christian writer had combined these two ideas before—the divine Logos, with the historical personality of Jesus. When therefore we find the ideas combined

---

[5] *Theological Review*, xii. *ut supra*, pp. 487 sq.

[6] *Ibid.* xiv. p. 333.

as in Justin, we are necessarily referred to the fourth Gospel for them; for the strangely inverted suggestion of Volkmar, that the author of the fourth Gospel borrowed from Justin, is on chronological, if not on other grounds, certainly untenable.[7]

his view in 1883,

In his Inaugural Lecture on the *Study of the New Testament*, delivered before this University in 1883, the Professor marks the advance which had taken place in the ten years which had passed since the publication of his earlier work on the *Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel*, in 1872. Then he had excused himself from dealing with the external evidences on the ground that the results were inconclusive. This cannot, he observes, be said now, and among other changes he notes that Justin gives no uncertain sound.[8] He thinks also that the labours of the two scholars to whom I have referred, Dr. Ezra Abbot and Professor Drummond, had

> placed quite beyond question Justin's acquaintance with the Gospel;

and he adds :—

> Greater importance attached to the opinions of Professor Drummond and Dr. Ezra Abbot, as they presented, perhaps, a nearer approach to rigid impartiality than had yet been seen in any English work dealing with the subject. Both these writers are Unitarians—the one English and the other American—and they are besides scholars, as it seems to me, of singularly calm and balanced judgment.[9]

---

[7] *Gospels in the Second Century*, 1876, p. 287.

[8] *Inaugural Lecture*, 1883, pp. 28, 29.

[9] *Ibid.* p. 8.

In addressing the Church Congress at Reading later in the same year, Dr. Sanday returned to the subject, and with special reference to the arguments urged upon the other side by Dr. Edwin A. Abbott[1] he writes :—

> I have been lately reading Justin again, with a view to test the force of this conclusion [that Justin regarded the Fourth Gospel as not possessing Apostolic authority]; and it is impressed upon me more forcibly than ever that Justin really implies the Fourth Gospel, and implies it, not only on the surface, but deep down in the substance of his thought. Frequently as Justin brings in the Logos doctrine, it is almost always in immediate connexion with the subject of the Incarnation. Page after page, time after time that the one is mentioned, the other immediately follows. *ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο* seems to be ringing in Justin's ears. But these are the words of St. John and not of Philo.[2]

Dr. Westcott,

I am not sure that the last witness whom I am about to quote, fared quite so well in the article which suggested those whom we have just heard, but few names will seem of more weight to many of those whom I am addressing than that of Dr. Westcott. His studies of Justin and of the whole field of critical and patristic learning are not of to-day or of yesterday. It is now thirty-five years since the first edition of his work *On the Canon of the New Testament* was published, and it is hardly too much to say that every leaflet which has appeared on this subject during all these years has had the fullest weight given to it in the sensitive balance of an exceptionally exact and widely read scholar's judgment. In 1881 he writes :— his view in 1881

---

[1] *Modern Review*, July and October, 1882.

[2] *Official Report*, 1883, p. 93.

> It is unlikely that I shall ever again be able to revise what now stands written;

and under the impression—happily a mistaken one—that his pen was touching for the last time the work of his life from early manhood onwards, he says :— repeated in 1889.

> In one particular of some importance I have felt able after a fresh consideration of the evidence to speak more confidently than in former editions. There is, I think, no reasonable doubt that the writings of Justin Martyr shew that he was acquainted with the Gospel of St. John.[3]

Consensus of opinion.

I submit that in the remarkable consensus of opinion which I have just quoted, there is a solid foundation for the belief that Justin knew and used the Fourth Gospel. I submit that it is a necessary deduction from Justin's clearly stated position in relation to the Apostolate, as the channel through which truth came to the Church from the divine Head, that he could not possibly have used the Fourth Gospel as a manual of doctrine without believing in its Apostolic origin. I submit that in the historic nexus between Justin and Irenæus there is proof that the Gospels of the Church in A.D. 130–140 were the same as the Gospels of the Church in A.D. 170–180, and that the Fourth Gospel was certainly included.

Why Justin did not quote

Shall I be asked by some of my younger hearers, 'Why, if Justin admitted the Fourth Gospel as he the Fourth Gospel more fully.

---

[3] *On the Canon of the New Testament*, Notice to ed. v. 1881, p. xliii; cf. ed. vi. 1889, pp. xlii, xliii.

did the other two or three, did he not more frequently quote it for matters of fact?' 'Why does he even seem to avoid a quotation which was ready to his hand in S. John, to find a much less appropriate one in S. Matthew or S. Luke?' My answer is simply that I do not know.

Reasons suggested.

But I have already pointed out that a fully sufficient reason may be found in the characteristics of the writing and of the persons whom Justin addressed. It is possible that two or more of the synoptic Gospels had been formed into a harmony, such as we know was arranged by Justin's pupil Tatian, in which the Fourth Gospel had not yet found a place. It is possible that a merely accidental reason made it difficult for Justin to have access at the moment to a roll which contained S. John. It is possible Dr. Keim's explanation is right, and that Justin did not make use of S. John because of its opposition to chiliastic doctrine.[4] It is admitted that the Fourth Gospel did not pass into circulation until much later than the others, and it is quite possible that it had not so fully left its mark on the distinctly Pauline church in Rome. All this is matter of more or less uncertainty. The fact is that we really know very little about Justin. He lived more than seventeen hundred years ago, and most of his writings have been lost in the wreck of time. The *Apologies* with which we are dealing are but fragments which have been saved. But we know that he wrote other works which from their nature must have dealt more fully with questions like that of the Fourth Gospel; and we know with certainty what men thought who were contemporaries and immediate successors of Justin, and were familiarly acquainted with his books.[5] The argument from ignorance is never worth much, but it is worth nothing in the presence of this full knowledge.

---

[4] 'Ich zweifle nicht, dass ganz vorzüglich der Bruch des Evangeliums mit dem Chiliasmus Justin zurückstiess. Hier ist Tryph. 80 ungemein belehrend. So mild er sich ausdrückt gegen die Nicht-Chiliasten, so sagt er doch zum Schluss: *ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ εἴ τινές εἰσιν ὀρθογνώμονες κατὰ πάντα Χριστιανοὶ, καὶ σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν γενήσεσθαι ἐπιστάμεθα καὶ χίλια ἔτη ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ, κ.τ.λ.*' *Geschichte Jesu v. Nazara*, i. p. 140.

Existing works fragments.

It is impossible to overrate the importance of the testimony of Justin, but he no longer stands alone as a witness from the middle of the second century. While he is defending Christianity against heathenism, there are by his side in Rome, representatives of the extreme forms of Jewish-Christian teaching which meet us in the so-called Clementines; and the rationalist Gnostic tendencies are represented by Valentinus on the one hand, and by Marcion on the other. All are in different ways evidence of the wide acceptance at that time of the Fourth Gospel.

The Clementines:

That the Clementine Homilies quote it, is scarcely now a matter of opinion. Professor de Lagarde, in the *Prolegomena* to his edition of the *Clementina*,[6] gives fifteen instances of quotation from or reference to S. John. The list is not quite complete and some of

They quote the Fourth Gospel,

---

[5] Cf. *supra*, pp. 68 sqq.

[6] *Clementina*, 1865, Preface, p. 30.

the instances are of little importance, but they are as a whole perfectly conclusive. Since the discovery of the complete MS. of the Homilies in 1853, to which we shall refer hereafter, their use of the Fourth Gospel has been recognized on all sides. The author of *Supernatural Religion* is of course not convinced, though even Strauss[7] was, and Dr. Hilgenfeld has taken occasion, in a review of the work, to express his own dissent from the writer's opinions, and his own belief that he will find no support for them in Germany or Switzerland.[8] The question which we now have to ask about the Clementines is, not whether they quote S. John, but what is their own date, and what is therefore the value of their evidence. Now we shall find that modern criticism has assigned them to almost every period of the second century. On the one hand a pillar of the papacy, and on the other hand one of the *momenta* in the development of Baur's scheme of the history of doctrine, no writings have ever obtained a more entirely undeserved fame, and no writings have ever been more subject to the baneful influence of extreme partisanship. Their date cannot yet be considered as settled; but while the present Roman form is probably to be assigned to the latter half or even to the close of the

their probable date,

---

[7] *Das Leben Jesu*, 1864, p. 69. Cf. Lectures IV. p. 210, and VII. pp. 374 sq.

[8] 'In Deutschland und der Schweiz wird es kaum jemand glauben, dass Clem. Hom. xix. 22 von Joh. 9, 1–3 unabhängig sein sollte.' Review of *Supernatural Religion*, ed. vi. in *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 1875, xviii. p. 584. Cf. *Einleitung* 1875, p. 43, esp. note 1, and p. 734.

century, the original form, Eastern in origin and Aramaic in language, cannot be later, and is probably much earlier, than the middle of the century. The student of these writings will remember their hardly-concealed antagonism to S. Paul, and therefore to S. John, and will see that they are in the position of an unwilling witness. This makes them for our present purpose the more valuable; as does the fact that, speaking in Rome and under the name of Clement, they are really the voice of the East speaking the language of the Elkesaites.

their evidence.

Valentinus, fl. 138–60.

Valentinus was the master of a school which promulgated the most profound and wide-spreading system of Gnosticism, and numbered among his disciples, Ptolemæus, Heracleon, Marcus, and Theodotus. He was probably by birth an Egyptian, by training an Alexandrian,[9] and by residence a Cypriote, before he came to Rome, which he must have made his head-quarters between A.D. 138 and A.D. 160. He had not left the communion of the Church on his arrival in Rome,[1] but while there, according to what seems to be the meaning of Irenæus,[2] he flourished as a leader of his sect during the episcopate of Pius. What led to the separation we need not inquire. It may have had its root, as his opponents are not slow to tell us, in the disappointed ambition of an able man who saw his inferiors preferred to himself—a not infrequent cause of division in the Church, or of perverted critical judgment; or it may be that here, as certainly in other instances, the apologists of the second century have set the unhappy example to their successors in later years, of imputing motives which had no real existence. Whatever the cause may have been, it is obvious that, as a witness to the use of the Fourth Gospel, Valentinus is of the greater value to us just because he speaks from both sides of this cleavage.

---

[9] Epiphanius, *Hæres.* xxxi. cap. 2, *Panaria*; ed. Oehler, *Corpus*, tom. ii. pp. 306 sqq.

[1] Tertullian, *De Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, xxxvi.; ed. Oehler, tom. ii. p. 34.

[2] *Adv. Hær.* iii. iv. 2; ed. Harvey, tom. ii. p. 17. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* iv. 11.

Followers form two schools:

Let us remind ourselves that the witness of his followers is also of the greater value, because they were divided into two schools—one spreading over Syria and Egypt, the other and chief division having its centre in Rome and its extensions through Italy and Gaul.

In the East:

From the East come the *Excerpta Theodoti* and *Doctrina Orientalis*, a series of extracts with criticisms, ascribed to Clement of Alexandria and printed in his works, which contain frequent quotations from S. John.[3]

---

[3] Ἐκ τῶν Θεοδότου καὶ τῆς ἀνατολικῆς καλουμένης διδασκαλίας ἐπιτομαί. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Græca*, tom. v. pp. 134–178. Clem. Alex. *Opp.* ed. Dindorf, iii. pp. 424 sqq. 'The only useable edition (along with the older editions of Sylburg and Potter) is that of Bunsen in the first volume of the *Analecta Antenicaena* (London, 1854), pp. 205–278. . . . Clemens made use of a Valentinian writing, which appealed to Theodotus as its chief authority.' Lipsius, art. *Valentinus* in Smith and Wace's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, iv. p. 1082. Cf. esp. Heinrici, *Die Valentinianische*

In the West: Ptolemæus and Heracleon, fl. 170–180.

From the West we have Ptolemæus and Heracleon. Ptolemæus was among the earliest disciples of Valentinus and lived on to the time of Irenæus, who represents him as the head of a party. It was from the commentaries of these disciples of Valentinus, and from personal intercourse with some of them, that Irenæus obtained his own knowledge of the subject; and it was to counteract the then existing form of the heresy—namely, the school of Ptolemæus, which he describes as an offshoot of that of Valentinus—that he devoted his great work.[4] One section at least is an extract from Ptolemæus himself.[5] This is a connected exposition of part of the Prologue of S. John, who is referred to as 'John the disciple of the Lord,' and it ends with the words, 'et Ptolemæus quidem ita.'[6] A little earlier in the same chapter there is a quotation with an interpretative change of text by which our Lord's question 'Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say?' becomes '(When He said) What I shall say, I know not.'[7] There is also extant an *Epistle of Ptolemæus to Flora* which is preserved by Epiphanius,[8]

Evidence of Irenæus,

of Epiphanius,

Gnosis und die Heilige Schrift, pp. 88 sqq.; and Zahn, *Forschungen u.s.w.* iii. p. 122.

[4] *Adv. Hær.* i. Preface, § 2; ed. Harvey, tom. i. p. 5.

[5] *Ibid.* i. 8, § 5; ed. Harvey, tom. i. p. 80.

[6] These words occur in the contemporaneous Latin, but there is no equivalent in the Greek or in the account of Epiphanius (*Hær.* xxxiii.) which is based on it. It is certain, however, that it is Ptolemæus who is quoted.

[7] *ἐν τῷ εἰρηκέναι· καὶ τί εἴπω οὐκ οἶδα*; *Adv. Hær.* i. 8, § 2 *ad fin.*; ed. Harvey, tom. i. p. 70. *νῦν ἡ ψυχή μου τετάρακται, καὶ τί εἴπω*; John xii. 27.

[8] *Hær.* xxxiii. 3–7; ed. Oehler, *Corpus*, tom. ii. pp. 400–412.

and in which the words ‘All things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made,’ are quoted with the formula ‘The Apostle saith.’[9]

Dr. Hilgenfeld, to whom we are indebted for the most careful edition of this *Letter to Flora*,[1] and whose negative position will not escape your memory, recognizes the unhesitating acceptance of S. John by the Valentinians.[2]

of Clement and Origen,

Irenæus mentions Heracleon in immediate connexion with Ptolemæus,[3] and Clement calls him ‘the most esteemed representative of the school of Valentinus;’[4] Origen tells us that he was an acquaintance of Valentinus,[5] using the same term which Irenæus applies to Ptolemæus. Now Heracleon wrote the first known commentary on S. John, large portions of which have been preserved by Origen,[6] and have been collected by Grabe,[7] and in a more convenient form by Hilgenfeld.[8] These extracts give comments on passages of considerable length, and it is certain that the author of them regarded the text which he was expounding as of divine authority.

---

[9] *ἔτι γε τὴν τοῦ κόσμου δημιουργίαν ἰδίαν λέγει εἶναι (ἅτε πάντα δι᾽ αὐτοῦ γεγονέναι, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ γεγονέναι οὐδέν) ὁ ἀπόστολος, . . . Ptolemæi ad Floram Epist.* 1. D. a § 45. Epiphanius, *Hær.* xxxiii. ed. Oehler, *ut supra*, p. 402. *πάντα δι᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν*, John i. 3.

[1] Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1881, pp. 214–230.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 230.

[3] *Adv. Hær.* ii. 4. 1; ed. Harvey, tom. i. p. 259.

[4] *Strom.* iv. 9. 73; ed. Klotz, tom. ii. p. 316.

[5] *τὸν Οὐαλεντίνου λεγόμενον εἶναι γνώριμον ‘Ηρακλέωνα.* Origen *In Joannem*, tom. ii. 8.

[6] *In Joannem, ut supra.*

[7] *Spicilegium*, ed. 2, 1714, tom. ii. pp. 87 sqq. and 237 sqq.

[8] *Ketzergeschichte, u. s. w.*, pp. 472–498.

of Hippolytus.

The evidence which is furnished by Hippolytus, of whom I shall have to speak more fully in a subsequent lecture,[9] to the use of the Fourth Gospel by the Valentinians is also clear. When we read, 'On this account, he says, the Saviour says, "All that came before me are thieves and robbers,"'[1] we have no doubt that the writer is quoting S. John, as he is also when he uses the familiar Johannine phrase 'the ruler of this world.'[2]

But while this is positive evidence for the Valentinians, it is not quite certain that Valentinus is personally quoted by the formula 'he says.' The context however makes it in the highest degree probable that it is the founder of the school to whom reference is made; and we shall find later that the probability is strengthened by a similar method of reference to Basilides.[3]

---

[9] Cf. Lecture VII. pp. 365 sqq. and 392 sq.

[1] *Διὰ τοῦτο, φησί, λέγει ὁ σωτήρ· Πάντες οἱ πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἐληλυθότες κλέπται καὶ λῃσταὶ εἰσί.* Hippolytus, *Refutatio Omnium Hæresium*, vi. 35; ed. Duncker et Schneidewin, p. 284.

πάντες ὅσοι ἦλθον πρὸ ἐμοῦ κλέπται εἰσὶν καὶ λῃσταί· John x. 8.

[2] *διάβολος, ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου,* . . . *Ut supra*, vi. 33, p. 280.

ὁ διάβολος δὲ ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου, . . . *Ut supra*, vi. 34, p. 282.

νῦν ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου ἐκβληθήσεται ἔξω· John xii. 31. Cf. John xiv. 30 and xvi. 11.

[3] Cf. Lecture VII. pp. 370 sqq.

Testimony of Valentinus to Fourth Gospel.

But that the system of Valentinus himself, and the names of the æons as expressed in the well-known passage of Irenæus in the eleventh chapter of his first book, which is probably based upon an earlier written statement,[4] implies the Fourth Gospel, just as do the thirty æons of the Ptolemæan systems in the first chapter, would seem to be beyond all possibility of doubt were it not for the fact that it has been doubted. The question really is, Which comes first, germ or development, the simple or the compound, the source or the stream ?[5]

The Valentinians a school.

The Valentinians, moreover, form a school. Ptolemæus and Heracleon were, as we have seen, personal disciples of the master, and the teaching of master and pupils forms a whole, developing indeed but homogeneous, which occupied much of the best thought of the second century from the fourth decennium onwards. Through its whole history this teaching implies the Fourth Gospel. A caricature presupposes an original.

The Catholics also a school.

And as the school is one, so also the Catholics who oppose it are one. Tertullian tells us that the opinions of these heretics had been met in careful works by holy men who had lived before himself, and that some indeed were contemporaries of the heresiarchs. He names, as we should expect, Justin, the philosopher and martyr, and Irenæus, the minute investigator of all doctrines, and includes also Miltiades whom he calls the sophist of the churches, and Proculus the Montanist, of chaste old age and eloquence.[6] We remember that Irenæus was the younger contemporary of Justin, whose works he knew well and quotes frequently, and Hippolytus was the disciple of Irenæus. But among the works written by Justin, which are not now extant, was a *Syntagma against all Heresies*, which may with very great probability be taken to be the chief source from which later writers derived their knowledge of the heresies of Justin's time, and may especially be assumed to be the written source from which Irenæus is drawing, in his account of Valentinus.[7] Tertullian, moreover, had the works of both Justin and Irenæus before him, and his treatise *Against the Valentinians* is little more than an expansion of the account in Irenæus. Justin, Irenæus, and Tertullian are a triad of Catholics, as Valentinus, Ptolemæus, and Heracleon are a triad of Gnostics.

---

[4] Cf. esp. Lipsius; art. *Valentinus* in Smith and Wace's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, iv. p. 1080; and Heinrici, *Die Valentin. Gnosis*, *ut supra*, p. 40.

[5] Cf. *Excursus* A. (Watkins) in Ellicott's *New Testament Commentary*, 1879, p. 552.

We are now in a position therefore to estimate the bearing of the following general statements :—

Statements by Irenæus,

Irenæus speaks of 'those who are followers of Valentinus and make very full use of the gospel which is according to John.' . . .[8]

Tertullian contrasts Valentinus and Marcion in and Tertullian.

---

[6] *Adversus Valentinianos*, cap. v.; ed. Oehler, tom. ii. p. 387.

[7] Justin, *Apol.* i. 26, 58; Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* iv. 6, 2, ed. Harvey, tom. ii. 158; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* iv. 11. Cf. Caspari, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols*, iii. 363, note 171.

[8] 'Hi autem qui a Valentino sunt, eo quod est secundum

their use of Scripture, in that while the latter used the knife and not the pen, Valentinus perverted the truth by misinterpretation, but accepted 'the whole instrument.' [9]

Conclusion as to use of Gospel by Valentinus.

The conclusion which the inquirer for truth will draw is, I think, not less than this: that, while we cannot consider some of the subsidiary arguments to be beyond doubt, the general position of the Valentinian school of Gnostics in relation to the Fourth Gospel is fully established, and that this evidence carries it back to a time earlier than the division from the Catholic Church. Here Theodotus is one with Clement; Heracleon is one with Tertullian; Ptolemy is one with Irenæus; Valentinus is one with Justin. Here the unity of a school of dissidents is one with the unity of the Catholic Church, in the higher unity of their earlier communion;

Johannem plenissime utentes. . .' *Adv. Hær.* iii. 11. 7; ed. Harvey, tom. ii. 46.

[9] 'Alius manu scripturas, alius sensus expositione intervertit. Neque enim si *Valentinus integro instrumento uti videtur*, non callidiore ingenio quam Marcion manus intulit veritati. Marcion enim exerte et palam machæra, non stilo usus est, quoniam ad materiam suam cædem scripturarum confecit: Valentinus autem pepercit, quoniam non ad materiam scripturas, sed materiam ad scripturas excogitavit, et tamen plus abstulit et plus adiecit, auferens proprietates singulorum quoque verborum et adiciens dispositiones non comparentium rerum.' Tertullian, *De Præscr. Hæret.* xxxviii.; ed. Oehler, tom. ii. p. 36. Cf. *ibid.* xxx.; and *De Resurrectione Carnis*, lxiii., ed. Oehler, tom. ii. p. 550.

For meaning of *videtur* = *constat*, cf. Oehler's note *in loc.*, and especially *Adv. Marc.* iv. 2; *ibid.* ii. p. 162. 'Lucam *videtur* Marcion elegisse quem cæderet.'

For meaning of *instrumentum* = *testamentum*, cf. Lecture I. p. 26, note 6.

and in that unity they accepted the Gospel according to S. John.

Marcion, fl. 139–142.

Marcion was also a contemporary and fellow-citizen with Justin. The commencement of his work in Rome may be placed at A.D. 139–142. His gospel is admitted to have been a mutilated S. Luke, and we do not look for any traces of S. John, though it is not quite certain that these are wholly absent.[1] The questions which meet us here are such as these: 'Why was S. John not chosen?' 'Would not the Fourth Gospel have suited Marcion's purpose better than S. Luke?' 'Is not the fact that he rejected it, so far evidence that it was not at that date regarded as Apostolic and authoritative?' These questions are to be answered in part by a careful comparison of the teaching of Marcion with that of S. John. The one is through and through opposed to Judaism and to the Old Testament; the other presents a Gospel which has grown indeed as a tree whose leaves are for the healing of the nations, but all its roots are in the Jewish Scriptures. And in part we find the answer in Marcion's principle of selection as it is described by Tertullian. We read, for example, that 'when Marcion observed how S. Paul in the Epistle to the Galatians rebukes even Apostles for not walking according to the truth, and accuses false Apostles of perverting the Gospel of Christ, he endeavoured to destroy the position of the Gospels

Testimony of Tertullian,

---

[1] Cf. Zahn, *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons*, 1889, i. pp. 678 sq.

which are peculiar to and published under the names of Apostles or persons immediately connected with them.' S. John is named in the context, and it follows that, in Tertullian's opinion, Marcion rejected the Fourth Gospel, not because it was not Apostolic, but because it was.[2]

In another passage Tertullian addresses Marcion in these words:—

> If you had not carefully rejected some of the scriptures which disprove your views and corrupted others, the Gospel of John would have confounded you in this instance.[3]

and Irenæus.

It is probable that Tertullian is following Irenæus[4] in his treatise *Against Marcion*, as he certainly was in his treatise *Against the Valentinians*, and it seems to be certain, that both Irenæus and Tertullian assumed that Marcion knew and rejected the Fourth Gospel. They would not in controversial treatises have taken for granted that which their opponents might have at once disproved. The fact that they assumed his knowledge of the Gospel is itself proof of that knowledge; which indeed there is no real reason to doubt.

---

[2] 'Sed enim Marcion nactus epistolam Pauli ad Galatas, etiam ipsos apostolos suggillantis ut non recto pede incedentes ad veritatem evangelii, simul et accusantis pseudapostolos quosdam pervertentes evangelium Christi, connititur ad destruendum statum eorum evangeliorum quæ propria et sub apostolorum nomine eduntur, vel etiam apostolicorum, ut scilicet fidem, quam illis adimit, suo conferat.' Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* iv. 3; ed. Oehler, tom. ii. p. 163. Cf. 'pseudapostoli nostri et Judaici evangelizatores.' *Adv. Marc.* v. 19; *ibid.* p. 331, *ad med.*; 'interpolatum a protectoribus Judaismi.' *Ibid.* iv. 4, p. 164, *ad fin.*

[3] 'Si scripturas opinioni tuæ resistentes non de industria alias reiecisses, alias corrupisses, confudisset te in hac specie evangelium Joannis.' *De Carne Christi*, iii.; ed. Harvey, ii. p. 430.

[4] Irenæus certainly planned a treatise *Against Marcion*: 'Nos autem ex his quæ adhuc apud eos custodiuntur, arguemus eos, donante Deo, in altera conscriptione.' *Adv. Hær.* iii. 12. 12; ed. Harvey, tom. ii. p. 67. Cf. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* v. 8.

Now Marcion was the son of a bishop of Sinope, in Pontus, and was so wide a traveller that Tertullian constantly calls him the 'ship-master.' His evidence, which is obtained only by the cross-examination of an adverse witness, strikes therefore altogether independent veins of corroborative testimony.

The second century: *The first generation.*

When we pass to the first generation of the second century, we have to do with persons many of whom had themselves been, and whose parents had been, contemporaries with S. John; some of whom had been his converts and his personal acquaintances; some of whom had been his disciples. Of the Christians who died during this generation, many would have known his life and work for from twenty to fifty years. Let us take an example. Polycarp's martyrdom is now fixed by an increasing consensus of critical authorities, to which we shall have to refer hereafter, at A.D. 155 or 156.[5] Before his death he testified that he had served Christ for eighty and six years. This would place his birth not later than A.D. 69. S. John lived on to the reign of Trajan; that is, he died not earlier than A.D. 98. Polycarp was then about thirty years old at the time of the Apostle's death, and men who died during the first generation of the second century—that is, from thirty

Polycarp, c. 69–155–6.

---

[5] Cf. Lecture VII. pp. 389 sq.

to fifty years earlier than Polycarp—might, without exceeding the average of human life, have had a longer personal knowledge of S. John than he had.

and Papias, fl. 130.

Papias lived at a time when it was still possible to collect and test the oral traditions of those who had themselves been followers of the elders; and to 'learn what was said by Andrew or Peter or Philip or Thomas or James or John or Matthew or other disciples of the Lord;' and he himself knew two of those who had been personal 'disciples of the Lord, Aristion and the presbyter John.'[6] He was a bishop of Hierapolis, and knew there the daughters of Philip;[7] and on the other hand there is nothing improbable in the opinion that he was personally known to Irenæus, who makes frequent mention of him and had local associations with him.

Their writings.

Of the five books which Papias wrote as an *Exposition* or *Expositions of Oracles of the Lord*, we possess only a few lines which are preserved to us in Eusebius, and some lately discovered fragments which do not materially add to our knowledge.[8] Of Polycarp we have only part of one short letter which is certainly genuine.[9] That Papias and Polycarp both made use of the First Epistle of S. John, and that the Epistle cannot be really separated from the Gospel, are among the *data* of the best modern criticism; and that Papias is made by the statements of Irenæus and

---

[6] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* iii. 39.

[7] *Ibid. loc. cit.*

[8] Cf. Lecture VII. p. 394.

[9] Cf. *ibid.* pp. 402 sqq.

Eusebius, and still more by the 'silence of Eusebius,' a strong direct witness to the use of the Fourth Gospel in the first generation of the second century, has obtained a high degree of probability and acceptance since Bishop Lightfoot published his *Essays on the Work entitled Supernatural Religion.*[1]

The whole meaning of the history of this period has often been missed, because men have looked at the fossils of it as interesting specimens of an extinct life, instead of clothing them with flesh and blood, and seeing what that life really was. It is only the man who will think out the Church life and work of these years until the names Polycarp, and Barnabas, and Clement, and Ignatius, and Papias, represent to him actual living beings, who can understand the first conditions of the problem before us.

Testimony of Irenæus

I will not occupy your time by referring at greater length to proofs which are now easily accessible. I am more concerned to emphasize once again the unity of the life, and therefore of the testimony of the Church during these early years. Let me ask you, then, to consider the bearing of the following statements of Irenæus, writing towards the close of the century.

to Papias,

Of Papias he tells us that he was

> a hearer of John, a companion of Polycarp, and a man of the olden time.[2]

---

[1] *Contemporary Review*, Jan. Aug. and Oct. 1875. Republished *Essays*, 1889, ii. pp. v, vi.

[2] Ἰωάννου μὲν ἀκουστὴς, Πολυκάρπου δὲ ἑταῖρος γεγονὼς, ἀρχαῖος ἀνὴρ, . . . *Adv. Hær.* v. 33-4; ed. Harvey, tom. ii. p. 418.

to Polycarp.

Of Polycarp he says :—

And (so it was with) Polycarp also, who not only was taught by Apostles, and lived in familiar intercourse [συναναστραφεὶς] with many that had seen Christ, but also received his appointment in Asia from Apostles, as Bishop in the Church of Smyrna, whom we too have seen in our youth [ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμῶν ἡλικίᾳ], for he survived long, and departed this life at a very great age, by a glorious and most notable martyrdom, having ever taught these very things, which he had learnt from the Apostles, which the Church hands down, and which alone are true. To these testimony is borne by all the Churches in Asia, and by the successors of Polycarp up to the present time, who was a much more trustworthy and safer witness of the truth than Valentinus and Marcion, and all such wrong-minded men. He also, when on a visit to Rome in the days of Anicetus, converted many to the Church of God from following the afore-named heretics, by preaching that he had received from the Apostles this doctrine, and this only, which was handed down by the Church, as the truth. . . .

Moreover, there is an Epistle of Polycarp addressed to the Philippians, which is most adequate (ἱκανωτάτη), and from which both his manner of life and his preaching of truth may be learnt by those who desire to learn and are anxious for their own salvation. And again, the Church in Ephesus, which was founded by Paul, and where John survived till the times of Trajan, is a true witness of the tradition of the Apostles.[3]

His *Letter to Florinus.*

Or let the mind portray the scene which is thus described by Irenæus in a letter to Florinus, who had been his fellow-pupil in boyhood, but had now in old age wandered from the faith :—

These opinions, Florinus, that I may speak without harshness, are not of sound judgment; these opinions are not in harmony with the Church, but involve those adopting them in the greatest impiety; these opinions even the heretics outside the pale of the Church have never ventured to broach; these opinions the elders before us, who also were disciples of the Apostles, did not hand down to thee. For I saw thee, while I was still a boy (*παῖς ὢν ἔτι*), in Lower Asia in company with Polycarp, while thou wast faring prosperously in the royal court, and endeavouring to stand well with him. For I distinctly remember (*διαμνημονεύω*) the incidents of that time better than events of recent occurrence; for the lessons received in childhood (*ἐκ παίδων*), growing with the growth of the soul, become identified with it; so that I can describe the very place in which the blessed Polycarp used to sit when he discoursed, and his goings out and his comings in, and his manner of life, and his personal appearance, and the discourses which he held before the people, and how he would describe his intercourse with John and with the rest who had seen the Lord, and how he would relate their words. And whatsoever things he had heard from them about the Lord, and about his miracles, and about his teaching, Polycarp, as having received them from eye-witnesses of the life of the Word, would relate altogether in accordance with the Scriptures. To these (discourses) I used to listen at the time with attention by God's mercy which was bestowed upon me, noting them down, not on paper, but in my heart; and by the grace of God I constantly ruminate upon them faithfully (*γνησίως*). And I can testify in the sight of God, that if the blessed and Apostolic elder had heard anything of this kind, he would have cried out, and stopped his ears, and said after his wont, 'O good God, for what times hast Thou kept me, that I should endure such things?' and would even have fled from the place where he was sitting or standing when he heard such words. And indeed, this can be shown from his letters which he wrote either to the neighbouring Churches for their confirmation, or to certain of the brethren for their warning and exhortation.[4]

---

[3] *Adv. Hær.* iii. 3, 4. Bishop Lightfoot, *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, pp. 100, 101.

---

[4] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* v. 20. Bishop Lightfoot, *ut supra*, pp. 96, 97.

Papias and

In the few lines which Eusebius has preserved from the lost work of Papias, we learn that the writer

> did not delight in those who have very much to say, but in those who teach the truth; [5]

and there is great probability in the suggestion that he refers to the 'very much' which was said by Basilides, who, according to the account of his opponent Agrippa Castor, as given in Eusebius, wrote twenty-four books upon the Gospels.[6] These are doubtless to be identified with the *Exegetica*, from the twenty-third of which there is an extract in Clement of Alexandria.[7] The date of Basilides is admittedly not later than the reign of Hadrian, A.D. 117–138. The Groningen Professor Hofstede de Groot puts his life at A.D. 65–135, and his *floruit* in the reign of Trajan, A.D. 97–117; [8] but this work, though not without acute observations, leaves too much of the impression of an advocate to carry full conviction. We shall probably not be erring on the side of too early a date, if we put it, with De Groot's Leyden opponent, Dr. Scholten,[9] at A.D. 125. The important question is whether Hippolytus, when he treats of the system of Basilides, in which he admittedly makes clear quotation from S. John, is dealing at first hand

Basilides, fl. 125.

---

[5] *Hist. Eccles.* iii. 39.

[6] *Ibid.* iv. 7.

[7] *Strom.* iv. §§ 83 sqq.; ed. Klotz, tom. ii. p. 322.

[8] *Basilides u.s.w.*, *Deutsche vermehrte Ausgabe*, 1868, pp. 4–8.

[9] 'Er lebte zur Zeit Hadrians, um 125 zu Alexandrien.' Scholten-Manchot, *Die ältesten Zeugnisse*, 1867, p. 64.

with the founder of the system or with a later disciple.[1]

Other points

I shall not, at the close of a lecture, enter upon this difficult and delicate question of criticism. I shall for the present assume, without forgetting that it will be my duty to justify the assumption hereafter, that there is, at least, a distinct inclination of the balance of probability in favour of the opinion that Hippolytus is dealing with Basilides personally. If I anticipate a later discussion only to add that this view is strongly expressed by such critics as Mr. Matthew Arnold and M. Renan, it will show, meanwhile, that it is supported by thinkers of an independent position. We shall find that Mr. Arnold further believed that Gnosticism in its primitive forms is to be traced to a time earlier than the second century, and that the existence of Gnostic elements in any writing is far from being proof of a second-century date; a conclusion which is borne out by the most recent discussions on the subject.[2]

referred to a succeeding lecture.

Nor can I now do more than refer to results—the evidence for which I shall endeavour to present in a later lecture[3]—which have followed from recent investigations of the position of Ignatius and other Apostolic Fathers. Some among us may not be prepared to admit the earliest dates now claimed for the Ignatian Epistles, but few will refuse to admit the genuineness of the Vossian recension, or will fail to see that if these seven letters are by Ignatius, they connect the Fourth Gospel immediately with the age of S. John. To these points we shall recur.

---

[1] Hippolytus, *Refutatio Omnium Hæresium*, vii. 2. 20-27, x. 14; ed. Duncker et Schneidewin, pp. 346, 356–378, 514 sq.

[2] Cf. Lecture VII. pp. 371 sqq.

[3] Cf. *ibid.* pp. 395 sqq.

Result of the evidence of the second century:

Now, however, our study of the evidence of the second century, brief and cursory as it has necessarily been, must come to a close. What deductions are we justified in drawing from it?

What from the acceptance of the Third Generation of the century, represented by Irenæus, Clement, Tertullian, Theophilus, Melito, Apolinaris, Polycrates, the Gnostics?

What from the acceptance of the Second Generation, represented by Justin the Martyr, Tatian, the Clementines, Valentinus, Marcion?

What from the acceptance of the First Generation, represented by Papias, Basilides, Polycarp, Ignatius?

What from the acceptance alike by Catholics and heretics?

What from the acceptance alike in every part of Christendom?

What especially from the acceptance in Asia Minor, the scene of the Apostle's labours, in the generation which witnessed and immediately succeeded the Apostle's life?

What from the acceptance of the century taken as a whole, for human life may be classed in generations with sharply-marked divisions, but is lived in the unity of a web whose threads intertwine at every point?

What from the probability which arises from the mere co-existence of these separate witnesses, and is entirely independent of the witnesses themselves ?[4]

What from the union of these distinct arguments, which interpenetrate and support each other ?

The Fourth Gospel accepted as work of Apostle John.

The force of evidence will, of course, vary, as it is presented to different minds ; but I confess that the fuller examination, which I have been able to submit to you only in outline, seems to my own mind to leave no possibility of doubt. I invite you to the study—not of an outline, always imperfect, and in present circumstances of time and person specially so, but—of the evidence itself ; and to the earnest and candid student of that evidence it will, I am confident, appear, that it is as certain that the Fourth Gospel was believed throughout every decade of the second century to be the work of the Apostle John, as any fact of the second century can to us be certain.

We have found, chiefly by aid of pioneers who have gone before, tracks here and there in the unknown forest of second-century history. Wherever we can follow them we meet the stream which we are seeking to trace. We are now near the source. The stream which enters the century here must be—yes, it is—one with the river which passes from it yonder.

In the next lecture we shall meet it again in the flow of sixteen centuries of history.

---

[4] See opinion of Principal Campbell, *ut supra*, p. 52.

LECTURE III

THE ‘JUDGMENT OF CENTURIES’

END OF SECOND TO END OF EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

'"OLD THINGS NEED NOT BE THEREFORE TRUE,"
O BROTHER MEN, NOR YET THE NEW;
AH! STILL AWHILE THE OLD THOUGHT RETAIN,
AND YET CONSIDER IT AGAIN!

THE SOULS OF NOW TWO THOUSAND YEARS
HAVE LAID UP HERE THEIR TOILS AND FEARS,
AND ALL THE EARNINGS OF THEIR PAIN,—
AH, YET CONSIDER IT AGAIN!

WE! WHAT DO WE SEE? EACH A SPACE
OF SOME FEW YARDS BEFORE HIS FACE;
DOES THAT THE WHOLE WIDE PLAN EXPLAIN?
AH, YET CONSIDER IT AGAIN!

ALAS! THE GREAT WORLD GOES ITS WAY,
AND TAKES ITS TRUTH FROM EACH NEW DAY;
THEY DO NOT QUIT, NOR CAN RETAIN,
FAR LESS CONSIDER IT AGAIN.'

Clough.

LECTURE III.

And . . . many . . . believed . . . because of the word of the woman, who testified, . . . And many more believed because of his word; and they said to the woman, Now we believe, not because of thy speaking: for we have heard for ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Saviour of the world.—John iv. 39, 41, 42.

Facts of the reception. Evidence of sixteen centuries:

When we pass from the second to the third and the succeeding centuries, we pass in the critical history of the New Testament from the glimmering light of dawn to the full and clear light of day. Evidence of the existence and use of the Fourth Gospel now appears on every hand, and the validity of this evidence is admitted by all competent judges. There is a point at which the unconscious colouring of a preconceived theory can no longer alter the complexion of facts; and this point we have reached. Our task to-day, therefore, is not to adduce the evidence in detail—that would be impossible; but to estimate it as a whole, and to examine the principles on which it is founded. Even this would be impossible if we were to attempt more than a bird's-eye view; but more is not needed for our purpose.

Third century:

On the threshold of the third century there meets us much which cannot in any case be placed later, and ought, in the opinion of many men of best trained critical judgment, to have been placed earlier.

The Muratorian Fragment.

Now at latest, the fragment of the list discovered by Muratori and known by his name, not only testifies to the acknowledged use of the Fourth Gospel in the churches of Italy, but also supplies the first account of its origin.

The Versions.

Now, if not long before, come the Versions. How far back do the churches which demanded translations carry the existence of the original! How highly prized was that which each church, no longer content with the voice of the preacher, or the interpretation of the reader, took such pains to acquire! How widely spread, and therefore how deeply rooted, is the tree which already has branches in the Greek of Ephesus and Athens and Rome, the Latin of Carthage, the Coptic of Egypt, the Syriac of the East! Our knowledge of the history reminds us that every writing of the New Testament was not included in all these Versions—not the Apocalypse, for example, which some of our modern critics take to be the best attested book of the New Testament, and an argument from which to prove that the Fourth Gospel cannot be by S. John—but that the now disputed Fourth Gospel was then nowhere questioned.

Eastern church: Origen, 186–253.

Here is the evidence of Origen, in criticism the greatest of the Fathers, whose manhood extends over nearly the first half of the century. Scattered through his voluminous writings are frequent references to questions of the Canon, many of which

His division of the sacred writings.

are collected by Eusebius.[1] He does not clearly mark out his divisions, but in effect he foreshadows the more distinct analysis of Eusebius and makes three classes of writings—the genuine, the mixed, the spurious. The last class includes no writing in our present Bibles; the second class includes the Epistle of S. James, S. Jude, the Second Epistle of S. Peter, the Second and Third Epistles of S. John; the first class includes the remainder, that is, nearly the whole of our present New Testament. On the Gospel of S. John he wrote commentaries, the earliest portion of which belongs to his Alexandrian life, that is, to a date before A.D. 231, as we may infer from his own statement.[2] He considers the Gospels to be the 'first-fruits' of Scripture, and the Gospel according to S. John to be the 'first-fruits' of the Gospels.[3] He knows that there are 'four Gospels alone uncontroverted in the Church of God under heaven,' and of the writer of the Fourth Gospel he asks:—

> Why is it necessary for me to speak about him who reclined upon the breast of Jesus, John, who has left behind a single Gospel, though he confesses that he could write so many as not even the world could contain?[4]

Dionysius of Alexandria. c.195–265.

Immediately after Origen, and in part representing him, comes his most eminent pupil Dionysius,

---

[1] *Hist. Eccles.* vi. 25.

[2] Origen, *Commentaria in Ioannem*, tom. vi. § 1; ed. Huet., 1668, tom. ii. p. 94. Cf. Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* vi. 24.

[3] *Commentaria, ut supra*, tom. i. § 6; ed. *ut supra*, tom. ii. pp. 5, 6.

[4] Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* vi. 25. Cf. Reuss, *Geschichte der heiligen Schriften*, § 311; Davidson, *Canon*, p. 115; and Westcott, *Canon*, ed. 6, pp. 358 sq.

The Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse.

president of the catechetical school and bishop of Alexandria. Eusebius has preserved a portion of his work *On Promises*, which contains the first example of a considerable argument on one of the sacred Scriptures based upon internal evidence. It is perhaps also an example of the unconscious bias of party. Nepos, bishop of Arsinoë in Egypt, had published a work against the allegorical school of Alexandria, as Eusebius also tells us,[5] and had sought to establish the literal chiliastic interpretation of the Apocalypse. Dionysius was strongly opposed to this view, and in support of his arguments tries to show that the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse could not, on account of differences in the character, language, and construction of the two writings, be by the same author. The writer of the Apocalypse may have been, he thinks, a man named John. He fully allows that he was a holy and inspired man, but he could hardly concur in the opinion that he was John the Apostle, the son of Zebedee, the brother of James, who wrote the Gospel and the Catholic Epistle.[6] Dionysius is then the forerunner of much later criticism which has distinguished between these writings; but his distinction leads to results exactly the opposite of those of some critics with whom we shall have to deal. For him the Gospel is quite certainly the work of the Apostle, and therefore the Apocalypse is by another, though an inspired hand. For them the Apocalypse is quite

[5] Ἔλεγχος Ἀλληγοριστῶν, *Hist. Eccles.* vii. 24.

[6] *Ibid.* vii. 25.

certainly by the Apostle John, and the Gospel is therefore by another, and not an inspired hand.

The *Apostolical Constitutions.*

To the third century and the Eastern Church, probably to the diocese of Ephesus, belongs also the first part of the ecclesiastical code which is known as the *Apostolical Constitutions.* It contains the following official reference to the Gospels :—

> Afterwards let a deacon or a priest read the Gospels which I, Matthew and John, have handed down to you, and which Luke and Mark, the helpers of Paul, have left to you.[7]

Western Church :

In the Western Church we find the same consensus of statement. To Caius and Hippolytus of Rome, whose period overlaps the close of the second and the opening of the third century, it will be necessary to refer later, but we may at once note that their testimony to the Fourth Gospel is beyond question. Hippolytus indeed wrote a *Defence* or *Exposition of the Gospel and the Apocalypse* ;[8] and Caius, as we shall see, clearly admits the authenticity of the Gospel.

Cyprian, fl. 246–258.

Of the African writers of the third century, Cyprian is in every way the chief, and may be taken as the representative. For him there is no doubt as to the four Gospels, which are symbolized by the four rivers of paradise.[9] A more formal list of the books which were generally read in the African church of the third century is furnished in the *Codex Claromontanus*;[1] and here the four Gospels stand, as a matter of course, at the head of the stichometrical list, and S. John according to Western usage takes the second place.

---

[7] *Constitutiones Apostolorum*, ii. 57, ed. Cotelier, *Patres Apostolici*, tom. i. p. 262.

[8] Ὑπὲρ τοῦ κατὰ Ἰωάννην εὐαγγελίου καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως. Cf. Lecture VII. pp. 392 sq.

[9] 'Has arbores rigat quatuor fluminibus, id est, evangeliis quatuor, quibus baptismi gratiam salutaris cælesti inundatione lar-

Fourth and succeeding centuries: East: Eusebius, c. 260–339.

The fourth century is marked out in the history of the New Testament Scriptures by the investigations of Eusebius; and whatever opinion may be formed of some of this writer's statements, there can be no doubt that, in reference to our present subject, he had access in both the East and the West to full information as to the usage of the churches and the opinions of individuals; and that we have in him, for the first time, a careful examination of evidence on a distinctly historical principle. His division of the books of the New Testament, founded in part on that of Origen, is familiar to the beginner in the study of ecclesiastical history; and I need hardly pause to note that among the books which he regards as undoubted and generally acknowledged, come first of all the holy quaternion of the Gospels, and among them the Gospel according to S. John.[2]

Copies prepared for Constantine.

Eusebius must have exercised in another way an important influence on the Canon of the Greek church. About the year A.D. 332, the emperor Constantine

---

gitur.' Cyprian, *Epistolæ* 73. *Opp.* ed. Benedict. Venet. 1758, p. 317.

[1] Cf. Credner, *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanon*, pp. 175 sq.

[2] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* iii. 3, 25, 31, 39; vi. 14.

directed him to have fifty copies of a collection of the Scriptures specially prepared for public use. They were to be written by caligraphists who knew their work, in a readable hand, and upon parchment. Everything necessary for this important task, including two public carriages, was placed at the bishop's command, and the commission was duly executed. The choice of the contents was left to Eusebius as best acquainted with the use of the Church.[3] He does not formally tell us how he fulfilled this difficult and important trust, but his own writings give us safe guidance, and we shall not be wrong if we follow Credner[4] in supposing that the collections thus provided included all our present books of the New Testament, with the exception of the Apocalypse which was not then generally received in the Greek church. They would quite certainly have included the Fourth Gospel.

Cyril of Jerusalem, c. 315–386.

Cyril of Jerusalem devotes part of his *Catechesis* to an examination of the books of Holy Scripture. He advises that the works which are generally acknowledged should alone be read; and that works which are not read in churches should also be omitted in private reading. He places in the first rank the four Gospels, the Acts, the seven Catholic Epistles;[5]

---

[3] Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, iv. 36, 37; ed. Migne, tom. viii. p. 80.

[4] Credner, *ut supra*, pp. 205–213.

[5] Τῆς δὲ καινῆς διαθήκης, τὰ τέσσαρα μόνα εὐαγγέλια· τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ ψευδεπίγραφα καὶ βλαβερὰ τυγχάνει. Ἔγραψαν καὶ Μανιχαῖοι κατὰ Θωμᾶν εὐαγγέλιον, ὅπερ εὐωδίᾳ (*al.* ὅπερ, ὥσπερ εὐωδίᾳ) τῆς εὐαγγελικῆς ἐπωνυμίας ἐπικεχρωσμένον (*al.* προσωνυμίας) διαφθείρει τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν ἁπλουστέρων. Δέχου δὲ

and when he has later to speak of the Antichrist, he takes occasion to imply that he specially excludes the Apocalypse from his authorities. It is not that he denies its authenticity, but that he does not receive it as a divinely inspired and Canonical work.

Athanasius, c. 296–373.

Athanasius was a contemporary of both Eusebius and Cyril, and represents Alexandria and Egypt, as they represent Constantinople and Palestine. He took the opportunity of an annual pastoral letter, which the patriarchs of Egypt were in the habit of addressing to their flocks, to enter upon the question of the Canon. He does so with some hesitation, and offers an apology for venturing to deal with the subject, justifying himself by the example of S. Luke's preface. His method of treatment is not that of the critic entering upon an investigation for the benefit of scholars; but that of a bishop giving directions to the clergy and others of his own diocese, upon a matter which was still under discussion and upon which they naturally looked to him for guidance. 'In these books alone,' he asserts, 'is the doctrine of religion proclaimed. Let no one add to them. Let no one take anything from them.' The list of the writings of the New Testament which is thus made out is remarkable, in that it includes, for the first

Identity of his Canon

καὶ τὰς πράξεις τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων. Πρὸς τούτοις δὲ καὶ τὰς ἑπτὰ Ἰακώβου, καὶ Πέτρου, καὶ Ἰωάννου καὶ Ἰούδα καθολικὰς ἐπιστολάς· ἐπισφράγισμα δὲ τῶν πάντων, καὶ μαθητῶν τὸ τελευταῖον, τὰς Παύλου δεκατέσσαρας ἐπιστολάς. Τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ πάντα, ἐν δευτέρῳ κείσθω (*al.* *ἔξω κείσθω ἐν δευτέρῳ*). *Καὶ ὅσα [μὲν] ἐν ἐκκλησίαις μὴ ἀναγινώσκεται, ταῦτα μηδὲ κατὰ σαυτὸν ἀναγίνωσκε, καθὼς ἤκουσας.* *Catechesis*, iv. 36, ed. Reischl, i. 128, 130.

time in an Eastern catalogue, the Apocalypse, in opposition to both Eusebius and Cyril; and that it excludes all that is not contained in our present New Testament. The Canon which Athanasius drew up for his own people in the thirty-ninth year of his episcopate, that is, in the year A.D. 365, is identical with that which we commonly accept to-day.[6]

with our own.

Didymus of Alexandria, c. 309–395.

This direction of the bishop would meet with ready acquiescence throughout the diocese; but it did not of course affect other dioceses, nor did it necessarily command the allegiance of all scholars in Alexandria itself. On a question which was still open, and which was one of literary criticism, the director of the catechetical school might think himself as much entitled to express an opinion as a bishop and a patriarch. We accordingly find Didymus, who lived in Alexandria at the same time as Athanasius, publishing an exegetical work on the Catholic Epistles, which is now extant in Latin only, and teaching that the Second Epistle of S. Peter is not Canonical. The work is one for use in public service, its authenticity is not questioned, but it is not, in the opinion of Didymus, of Canonical authority.[7]

Gregory of

Gregory of Nazianzus is another famous contemporary of Athanasius who dealt with the books of

---

[6] ἐκ τῆς λθ′. ἑορταστικῆς ἐπιστολῆς. *Opp.* ed. Bened. 1777, tom. i. p. 765. Cf. the Syriac in *Festal Epistles*, Oxf. 1854, p. 139.

[7] 'Non igitur ignorandum, præsentem Epistolam esse falsatam, quæ licet publicetur, non tamen in canone est.' Didymus Alexandr. ed. Migne, p. 1774. Cf. Lücke, *Quæst. Didymian.* i. 13; Credner, *ut supra*, p. 230.

Nazianzus, c. 325–390.

the sacred Scriptures. Following the natural bent of his own poetic fancy, and following perhaps examples which go back as far as the Muratorian Fragment,[8] he composed his list of the Old and New Testament in verse. ‘Matthew,’ in Gregory’s view, ‘described the wonders of Christ for the Hebrews; Mark, for Italy; Luke, for Achaia; John, the great herald who had crossed the heavens, for all.’[9] The list does not include the Apocalypse; and the concluding lines prove that it is definitely excluded from the undoubted writings.[1] At the same time Gregory quotes it,[2] and the description of the author of the Fourth Gospel which I have just read is taken from it.

Amphilochius, fl. 374–394.

Included in the same volume with the works of Gregory has been commonly printed the catalogue of his friend Amphilochius, archbishop of Iconium in Lycaonia. He is aware of the doubts which some have as to the Hebrews, but dismisses them in a word. Whether three or seven Catholic Epistles are to be received he is less certain. ‘The Apocalypse,’ he tells us, ‘some would include, but it is excluded by most writers.[3] The Fourth Gospel is, though fourth in order, first in doctrinal importance, for this son of thunder gives forth in mighty sound the word of God.'[4] In the concluding lines Amphilochius speaks of this Canon of the inspired Scriptures as the 'probably most unfalsified;'[5] by which he seems to indicate on the one hand that no definitely fixed rule had yet obtained official recognition in the churches of Asia Minor, and, on the other hand, that more or less imperfect or intentionally altered lists were not unknown.

---

[8] Cf. Lecture I. p. 45.

[9] *Ματθαῖος μὲν ἔγραψεν Ἑβραίοις θαύματα Χριστοῦ·*
Μάρκος δ’ Ἰταλίῃ, Λουκᾶς Ἀχαϊάδι·
Πᾶσι δ’ Ἰωάννης, κήρυξ μέγας, οὐρανοφοίτης.
Gregory Nazianz. *Carmina* xii.; ed. Benedict. tom. ii. p. 260.

[1] *Ἰούδα δ’ ἐστὶν ἑβδόμη. Πάσας ἔχεις.*
Εἴ τι δὲ τούτων ἐκτὸς, οὐκ ἐν γνησίαις. *Ibid.*

[2] *Oratio* xvii. *Opp.*, *ut supra*, i. p. 536.

[3] *Τὴν δὲ Ἀποκάλυψιν τὴν Ἰωάννου πάλιν*
Τινὲς μὲν ἐγκρίνουσιν, οἱ πλείους δέ γε
Νόθην (νόθον) λέγουσιν.
Amphilochius, *Iambi ad Seleucum. Opera*, ed. Cambefis, p. 134;

Epiphanius, c. 320–403.

Epiphanius, bishop of Constantia or Salamis, is known to us chiefly as the historian of heresies, which he marks with a keen and ever-watchful eye. While dealing with the Aëtians,[6] he introduces parenthetically a list of the Scriptures, which is in the New Testament almost identical with that of Athanasius. But Wisdom and Sirach are also called divine Scriptures,[7] and the *Apostolical Constitutions* are a 'divine word and doctrine,'[8] though both are described elsewhere as 'doubtful.'[9]

Theodore of

The Greek church and school of Antioch is represented by Theodore bishop of Mopsuestia, who

---

Gallandi, *Bibliotheca* vi. p. 495.

[4] Προσθεὶς, ἀρίθμει τὸν Ἰωάννην χρόνῳ
Τέταρτον, ἀλλὰ πρῶτον ὕψει δογμάτων·
Βροντῆς γὰρ υἱὸν τοῦτον εἰκότως καλῶ,
Μέγιστον ἠχήσαντα τῷ Θεοῦ λόγῳ· *Ibid.*

[5] Οὗτος ἀψευδέστατος
Κανὼν ἂν εἴη τῶν θεοπνεύστων γραφῶν.
Opera, ed. Benedict., 1840, p. 1104.

[6] *Hæres.* lxxvi.; ed. Oehler, *Corpus*, tom. ii. pt. iii. p. 240.

[7] Cf. e.g. *Hæres.* lxiv.; *op. cit.* tom. ii. pt. ii. p. 316; and xxxiii. *op. cit.* tom. ii. pt. i. p. 412.

[8] *Hæres.* lxxx.; *op. cit.* p. 474.

[9] *Hæres.* viii.; *op. cit.* tom. ii. pt. i. p. 58. *Hæres.* lxx.; *op. cit.* tom. ii. pt. iii. p. 26.

Mop-
suestia,
c. 350–428.

was known as the *Exegete.* He is said by his opponent Leontius of Byzantium, who wrote towards the close of the seventh century, to have interpreted the Scriptures in a poor and spiritless fashion ; by which is meant probably that, after the manner of the Antiochene school, he did not follow the exuberant interpretation of the allegorists ; and he is further said to have subtracted from the divinely prescribed number of books. He rejected, Leontius tells us, Job, the Chronicles, the Song of Solomon, the titles of the Psalms, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther, the Epistle of S. James, the Second Epistle of S. Peter, the Second and Third Epistles of S. John, S. Jude, and the Apocalypse.[1] This is, however, to be taken as the statement of an opponent, writing after a long interval and from a very different point of view. But Theodore, free as he was in his treatment of the Canon, wrote a commentary on the Fourth Gospel which is largely preserved in the *Catena* of Corderius,[2] as are some important passages of the twentieth chapter in the acts of the fifth council.[3] It is said to exist entire in a Chaldee MS. version in the Monastery of S. George on the Tigris, near

---

[1] Leontius Byzantinus *contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos*, lib. iii. ; Gallandi, *Bibliotheca*, xii. p. 687. Cf. Credner, *Kanon u.s.w.* p. 229, and *Einleitung*, § 239, p. 649 ; Fritzsche, *De Theodori Mopsuesteni Vita et Scriptis*, 1836, p. 88 ; and especially Kihn, *Theodor von Mopsuestia und Junilius Africanus*, 1880, § 54 sqq., esp. § 56.

[2] Corderius, *Catena Patrum Græcorum in sanctum Joannem*, 1630. See especially the extract from Theodore in the *Proemium* ; and Fritzsche, *Theodori in Novum Testamentum Comm.*, Turici, 1847, pp. 19–42.

[3] Labbé-Mansi : *Conciliorum Collectio*, ed. 1763, tom. ix. pp. 207–209.

Maussul;[4] but in any case it establishes beyond doubt the fact that Theodore regarded the Fourth Gospel as an inspired book which was written by S. John.

John Chrysostom, c. 347–407.

A better known and in many ways greater representative of the Antiochene school, but not greater as an exegete and a critic, was John of the Golden Mouth, afterwards patriarch of Constantinople. In the wide range of his works there is no reference to the Apocalypse or to the four shorter Catholic Epistles.[5] Of the Fourth Gospel it need not be said there is constant use. The synopsis of the Old and New Testaments which is printed with the works of Chrysostom[6] excludes the Apocalypse, and expressly speaks of the three Catholic Epistles. An anonymous homily belonging to the same age and locality, printed also with Chrysostom's works, speaks of the second and third Epistles of S. John as rejected from the Canon by the Fathers, whereas the first Epistle all with one accord declared to be by S. John.[7]

---

[4] '. . . Alter est fama inclytus Theodorus Mopsuestenus a Nestorianis Doctor œcumenicus, et Commentator per antonomasiam dictus et habitus, in suo Eruditis desideratissimo *Commentario* in Ioannem, cujus exemplar in codice unico Chaldaico, anno superiori a me, maximo cum gaudio, in Cœnobio S. Georgii ad Tigrim, prope Maussul repertum, nescio an uspiam alibi habeat exemplum.' Khayyath, *Syri Orientales*, p. 76, note. Cf. Professor Swete's article in Smith and Wace's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, iv. p. 940.

[5] 'Et vere sanctus hic doctor, qui Scripturæ sacræ libros omnes in Homiliis suis adhibet, quatuor illarum Epistolarum loca nusquam affert; aut saltem hujusmodi loca in ejus scriptis nondum deprehendi: etiamsi vero deprehenderentur, non tamen inde sequeretur eam Scripturæ partem canonicam haberi: nam illis temporibus non pauca erant in quibusdam Ecclesiis, quæ legebantur quidem, sed canonica esse non reputabantur: ἀναγινωσκόμενα μὲν, μὴ κανονιζόμενα δέ.' Montfaucon, *Chrysostomi Opera*, Paris, 1834, vi. p. 635.

[6] *Synopsis Veteris et Novi Testamenti. Op. cit.* vi. pp. 372–3.

It will be clear to the reader of Chrysostom that for him the sacred Scriptures are books—*Biblia*—in a special sense; and it is probable that the later meaning of the word *Bible* arose from his frequent use of the term. 'Obtain books,' he cries in an often-quoted sermon—'obtain a Bible—that medicine of the soul; and if you care for no other, get at least the New Testament, the Acts of the Apostles, the Gospels, your perpetual teachers.'[8]

The result of this inquiry into the Canon of the Greek church in Syria in the beginning of the fifth century is that we find it to be identical with that which existed in the Peshito, the received Version of the Syrian church, more than two centuries before.

Period of Uncial MSS.

The third and fourth centuries are the golden age of Greek theology and criticism. We need not follow them into the ages of silver and lead; we need not pass to the extremer limits of the East; nor yet examine the period of the great Uncial manuscripts—actually existing witnesses which go back in material and form to the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries, tracing their text from the second century onwards, and finding their local history alike in Eastern and Western Christendom. It is nothing to our purpose to examine the lists of Anastatius Sinaita,

---

[7] *Opera, ut supra*, vi. p. 503.

[8] *Homil. IX. in Coloss. Op. cit.* xi. p. 451. I follow Montfaucon's reading τῶν ἀποστόλων τὰς Πράξεις, τὰ Εὐαγγέλια, διδασκάλους διηνεκεῖς.

Further survey not necessary.

of the Apostolic Canons, of Cosmas Indicopleustes, of John Damascene, of the Stichometry of Nicephorus, of Photius of Constantinople, of the pseudo-Athanasian synopsis, of Zonaras, of Alexius Aristenus, of Theodorus Balsamon of Antioch, of the monks Arsenius and Matthew, of Nicephorus Callistus, of Metrophanes Critopulus patriarch of Alexandria, of Cyril Lukar patriarch of Constantinople. It is nothing to our purpose to discuss the Canons of the earlier council of Laodicea in the fourth century; or those of the Trullan council of Constantinople, which devoted special labours to the settlement of the lists of the sacred books; nor need we pause at the second Nicene council of the eighth century; nor at the last council of the Greek church, which assembled in January of 1672 at Constantinople, and in March at Jerusalem, and finally undoing the work for which Cyril and Metrophanes had striven, followed the Roman decrees of Trent and canonized the Apocrypha. It is nothing to our purpose to trace the growth of the Syrian Canon in succeeding Versions; or the list which the African bishop, Junilius, framed from knowledge which he derived from the Persian school of Nisibis; or that which Bar-Hebræus formed from the use at Antioch; or that of the Ethiopian, or Armenian, or Russian churches. These include points which are of greater or less—some of them of very great—interest for the history of the Canon and of the disputed books; but throughout them all no word of discussion or doubt is ever raised as to the

Close of Canon in the East.

No doubt as to the Fourth Gospel.

Fourth Gospel. If it is singled out from the others, it is to occupy a place of honour, and to be made the chief, or ranked among the chief, of the sacred writings which God has given to the Church.

If we turn again from the history of the East to that of the West, we find similar results.

Border-land:

Three names are prominent as links between these separate halves of Christendom :—

Hilary, † 368.

Philaster, † c. 387.

Hilary of Poitiers, whose Canon is almost identical with that of Origen; Philaster of Brescia, chiefly known as the historian of heresies, who has for us this special interest that he speaks[9] of the heresy of those who rejected the Gospel and Apocalypse of S. John, a heresy the knowledge of which he almost certainly borrowed from Hippolytus, as we shall have occasion to see; Rufinus of Aquileia, who follows Athanasius as closely as Hilary follows Origen. But while the border-land was thus occupied, the general distinction that the Greek church did not accept the Apocalypse, and that the Latin church did not accept the Epistle to the Hebrews, still remained.

Rufinus, c.345–410.

In the West:

Jerome, c.346–420.

The two great Fathers of the Western church in the fourth century, Jerome[1] and Augustine,[2] both wrote commentaries on the Fourth Gospel, which was to each of them, without shadow of doubt, an inspired and sacred Scripture coming from the Apostle John. Their works in relation to the Canon are full of interest, though we may not here dwell on them. They found their completion in the synod of Hippo in A.D. 393, the more decisive synod of Carthage in A.D. 397, the decree of Innocent the First, the renewed synod of Carthage in A.D. 419. For the West, the question of the Canon was settled at the beginning of the fifth, to be opened again only at the beginning of the sixteenth century.

---

[9] *Hæres.* lx.; Oehler, *Corpus*, i. p. 60.

[1] 'Hieronymus Stridonensis, florens A.C. 378, *in Evangelia quatuor Commentarium* dedit, unico volumine comprehensum, qui periit.' Lampe, *Commentarius*, tom. i. p. 251.

[2] *In Joannis Evangelium. Tractatus* cxxiv.; ed. Migne, tom. iii.

Augustine, 354–430.

Close of Canon in the West.

The Alogi:

There is one seeming exception to this universal testimony which cannot be passed over, inasmuch as attention has been recently directed to it. The so-called Alogi are a shadowy people whose substantial existence is doubtful, and whose position in time and place, assuming that they did exist, is necessarily more doubtful still. But during the last few months they have again been brought into prominence by references made to them in Dr. Zahn's new *History of the Canon*[3] in which, following an earlier article of Dr. Harnack's,[4] he assumes that they were referred to by Irenæus. Zahn's treatment of the subject does not escape Harnack's trenchant criticism;[5] nor are either Zahn or Harnack allowed to pass unheeded by Dr. Hilgenfeld,

---

pp. 1379 sqq. Cf. 'Ioannes quoque apostolus in Evangelistis quatuor eminentissimus.' *De consensu evangelistarum*, tom. ii. cap. vi.; *ibid.* tom. iii. p. 1085.

[3] *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons*, 1888, Bd. i. 1 Hälfte, pp. 220 sqq.

[4] *Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie*, 1874, ii. pp. 163 sqq.

[5] *Das Neue Testament um das Jahr* 200. *Theodor Zahn's Geschichte . . . geprüft*, 1889.

Name appears first in Epiphanius.

who thinks that both have drawn conclusions from false premises, and that the Alogi of the second century—the *Ur-Aloger* as he calls them—are nothing more than the invention of Harnack.[6] The name occurs first in Epiphanius,[7] who is proud of his pun, and begs others to call those who denied the Johannine Logos by the name which he gave them, *A-logoi*, creatures deprived of reason, as they were. It is of course possible that he borrowed his pun, as he certainly borrowed his matter, from Hippolytus, who wrote, as we know from the inscription on the chair of his statue, a work on the Gospel and Apocalypse of S. John.[8] Hippolytus may have named the Alogi in his own now lost *Syntagma of Thirty-two Heresies*, may have derived his information from Irenæus, and may have meant the persons whom Irenæus (though he mentions Marcion, with whom he contrasts them in the same short paragraph) does not think worthy of more than the following notice:—

> But others, in order that they might make void the gift of the Spirit which was in the last times poured out upon mankind at the Father's good pleasure, do not admit that idea which is peculiar to John's Gospel, that is, that the Lord promised He would send the Paraclete, but they cast away at once both the Gospel and the prophetic spirit.[9]

---

[6] *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1889, iii. 330–348.

[7] Τί φάσκουσι τοίνυν οἱ Ἄλογοι; Ταύτην γὰρ αὐτοῖς τίθημι τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν· ἀπὸ γὰρ τῆς δεῦρο οὕτως κληθήσονται, καὶ οὕτως, ἀγαπητοὶ, ἐπιθῶμεν αὐτοῖς ὄνομα, τουτέστιν Ἄλογοι. Εἶχον γὰρ τὴν αἵρεσιν καλουμένην, ἀποβάλλουσαν Ἰωάννου τὰς βίβλους. Ἐπεὶ οὖν τὸν λόγον οὐ δέχονται τὸν παρὰ Ἰωάννου κεκηρυγμένον, Ἄλογοι κληθήσονται. *Hæres.* li. 3; Oehler, *Corpus*, ii. pt. ii. p. 50.

[8] Cf. Lecture VII. p. 362.

[9] *Adv. Hæres.* iii. 11. 9; ed. Harvey, ii. p. 51.

Heresy makers who are intent on extending their catalogues do not find it difficult to create a sect out of very doubtful materials, as anyone who will consult the pages of Philaster[1] or Epiphanius,[2] or the histories by Lipsius[3] or Hilgenfeld,[4] may readily see; and theory makers who are intent upon spinning their webs do not find it difficult from a very small amount of fact to cover a large field of fancy, as we shall have more than abundant occasion to observe in the course of these lectures.

They ascribe the Gospel to Cerinthus.

But if the Alogi represent anything real at all, or anything more than an argument pressed here and there, on internal grounds alone, against the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse, by some stray persons who did not approve the doctrine[5] which they contained, the whole line of the evidence, such as it is, tends to confirm the Apostolic authorship. For it ascribes these writings to the quite impossible Cerinthus, or in any case to his time; and in doing so it declares that objectors to the Fourth Gospel in the second or the early third century, could find no place or period for its composition, but that which is as necessary to the Johannine authorship, as it is vehemently denied by modern negative criticism. But the whole position of the Alogi in this argument is not more than that of a weapon which is seized in desperation to meet an opponent. As long ago as 1845 it was openly cast aside by Dr. Zeller in an article against the Johannine authorship of the Gospel which was published in the Tübingen *Year-Book.*[6] And it is a weapon which is fatal to the user when the opponent is armed by knowledge

---

[1] Oehler, *Corpus*, tom. i.

[2] *Ibid.* tom. ii.

[3] *Zur Quellen-Kritik des Epiphanios*, 1865. *Quellen der ältesten Ketzergeschichte*, 1875.

[4] *Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristenthums*, 1884.

[5] 'Rein dogmatischer Art, und darum für die historische Kritik bedeutungslos.' Credner, *Einleitung*, 1836, § 103, p. 261.

Rejection by Zeller.

---

[6] 'Wie wenig eine geschichtlich nachweisbare Tradition über das Johannesevangelium vorhanden war, zeigt auch der Widerspruch, welcher um das Ende des zweiten Jahrhunderts von den sog. Alogern gegen dasselbe erhoben wurde. Es ist wahr, die Gründe, auf welche sich dieser Widerspruch stützt, sind, so weit wir von ihnen wissen, durchaus dem Gebiete der inneren Kritik entnommen, und auch das ursprüngliche Motiv desselben scheint das dogmatische gewesen zu sein, den Montanisten die Stütze zu entziehen, welche ihnen die Johanneïschen Aussprüche über den Paraklet darboten. Insofern mögen sich die Vertheidiger des Evangeliums nicht mit Unrecht dagegen verwahren, dass die Aloger als Zeugen für eine demselben entgegenstehende Tradition gebraucht werden. Ja auch das möchte ich nicht geradezu behaupten, dass die Aloger ihren Widerspruch gegen eine allgemein als apostolisch anerkannte Schrift nicht hälten wagen können: die Apokalypse war diess in Kleinasien ohne Zweifel, und doch wurde sie von ihnen für ein Werk des Cerinth erklärt. Der Verfasser der Clementinen wagt sogar, die Authentie der mosaischen Bücher zu bezweifeln, was in jener Zeit ungleich mehr hiess, als die einer neutestamentlichen Schrift in Anspruch nehmen. Um so mehr zeigt aber der ganze Verlauf dieses Streits, so weit wir von ihm wissen, wie wenig es sich hier überhaupt um Fragen der litterarischen Kritik handelte. Die Aloger bestreiten das Evangelium wegen seiner inneren Beschaffenheit, und Irenäus antwortet darauf, es müsse unsere vier kanonischen Evangelien geben, weil es auch vier Himmelsgegenden und vier Hauptwinde gebe, und weil die Cherubim viererlei Gestalten haben. An die Frage, von der die Entscheidung des Streits doch zunächst abhieng, die Frage nach den Zeugnissen für den apostolischen Ursprung des Evangeliums, scheint Niemand gedacht zu haben. Das ist das historische Bewusstsein der Kirche am Ende des 2ten Jahrhunderts.' Zeller, *Die äusseren Zeugnisse über das Dasein und den Ursprung des vierten Evangeliums. Theologische Jahrbücher*, 1845, pp. 645-6.

and turns it back upon him. The records of the past are searched and re-searched for men who reject the Fourth Gospel. No living men can be found: the ghosts of Alogi are said to be seen in the darkness. But there were real men—Celsus, Julian, Porphyry, Arius, are instances—to whose position it was as vital to deny the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel, as it is to their nineteenth century successors. History supplies no hint that any one of them ever made the attempt. Their silence becomes only the more emphatic when it is broken by the inaudible whispers of Alogi, and utters witness more decisive than even the all-consenting voices of the Church.[7]

Their negative witness.

Accepting then the fact, which is hardly questioned, and with our present knowledge is really not questionable, that from the last quarter of the second

Principles of the reception.

---

[7] Since this was written I find that Dr. Salmon has lately expressed the following opinion:—'In fact I now believe that "the Alogi" consisted of Caius, and, as far as I can learn, nobody else. . . . I consider the work of Hippolytus, of which Epiphanius made use, must have said very little about the opponents of the Gospel. When Epiphanius deals with the opponents of the Apocalypse, the objections and replies have every mark of antiquity, and were no doubt derived from Hippolytus. But the section on the Gospel is distinctly Epiphanius's own. He cites authors later than Hippolytus: Ephraem (c. 22); Porphyry (c. 8). The system of chronology is not that of Hippolytus, nor does he agree with Hippolytus as to the duration of our Lord's ministry on earth. The whole section gives me the impression that Epiphanius, being obliged by his title to answer objections to the Gospel, and finding none specified in his authorities, was reduced to manufacture objections, as well as answers, by his own ingenuity.' *Introduction to the New Testament*, ed. 4, pp. 229-31, note.

century to the close of the eighteenth century, the Fourth Gospel was received throughout Christendom as an Apostolic and inspired writing, we proceed further to inquire, in order that we may have a clear view of the 'judgment of centuries,' upon what principles this acceptance was based. The object of our immediate inquiry is the Fourth Gospel only, and if our principles prove to be often of wider application than is necessary for the task which we are undertaking, and to refer to the New Testament generally, we must be content to limit our inferences to our own part of the subject. And perhaps to some the inquiry will gain in clearness if we first approach it from the standpoint of the present, rather than from that of the past.

Views now commonly held:

Now if the question were put to a number of ordinary Christian men and women: 'What is your own ground for accepting the Fourth Gospel as a sacred book coming to you from God, and in what sense do you understand it to be so?', and if each one tried to answer frankly and fully, exactly as he thought, and not in the meaningless language of platitudes, some would find that they had hardly thought at all, and the answers of those who had thought would be on widely differing lines. But the most important of them would be something like the following:—

One would say,

The authority

'I believe in the holy Catholic Church. I believe in the pure and Apostolic branch of it, in which by the providence of God I was born, in which I live, in which I hope to die. The Church has from the first received this writing as part of her sacred Scriptures. She has never had any doubt about it. She has not only been a witness to its reception as part of history, but has in her own sacred synods decreed its acceptance as a doctrine. I recognize in the voice of the Church the voice of my Lord who promised to abide in the Church, and the voice of the Comforter whom He promised, to guide the Church into all truth; and I accept this writing as vouchsafed unto me by God in and through His Church.

of the Church.

'And I accept it in the exact sense in which the Church accepts it. I do not find that she has ever marked out a limit of inspiration, or that she has ever defined the matter or method of inspiration, and I do not draw lines where she has not done so. No attack on the external form of the sacred writing touches my faith in its inner substance as taught to me by the Church. Nor am I in any way alarmed by critical attacks upon the authenticity or genuineness of the book. I cannot judge of these subjects, and I am not sure that it would be part of my duty to do so if I could. Do you tell me that in obedience to Apostolic precept it is my duty 'to be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh me a reason of the hope that is in me'? Yes; but the Apostle adds, 'with meekness and fear,' and he is addressing the body, not the individual member. The command, moreover, has no special reference to the reception of a sacred book, and if it had, the knowledge of my fathers and brethren—the authority of the Church—may be a better reason than my own ignorance. There is an *ecclesia docens*, but I form no part of it. The Church has always had, will always have, doctors and teachers, and will always have the divine Teacher. My duty is to obey, not to judge. I have indeed the right of private judgment and its responsibility. I exercise it by submitting myself to the Church. Did I need other inducements to follow this which seems to me the only safe course, I should find them in the almost countless number of divisions and subdivisions of Christian people, all of whom base their often conflicting faiths on their own views and interpretations of the Bible, and in the strange alarm of even Church people when some attack which for the moment seems successful, and may be really successful, is made, not on a doctrine of Scripture or of the Church, but on some accretion which is no part of either. As a Churchman, I am a member of a great household. The family has lived in the house for centuries. The signs of its historic past meet the eye at every turn—in the picture galleries, the libraries, the heraldic quarterings, the chapel, the mausoleum. There is an unwritten record going back beyond knowledge in its institutions, customs, traditions. Who will dare challenge its possession ? Who will question its title ? And if anyone ignorant of its claims and history does so, the question is not one for me but for the heads of the family. I seek to do my duty and live a peaceful life, anxious only about what affects the family from within, disturbed about nothing which threatens it from without. I know the sweet blessings of a corporate life, and of the submission which is necessary to my own union with it.'

Such has been the language, not of weakness, but of strength; not of ignorance, but of some of the greatest intellects in our own and in preceding generations, in our own and in other branches of the Catholic Church of Christ.

Now, for the man who accepts the authority of the Church, criticism upon such a question as the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel has no point of attack. The Church is for him 'a witness and a keeper of holy Writ.' He does not believe the Church to be infallible apart from Holy Scripture; nay, he accepts her very creeds[8] because they 'may be proved by most certain warrants of' Holy Scripture, and if he is an Anglican churchman, he believes further that 'Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation.' But the Church is to him the witness of what Scripture is; she is 'the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.'[9] Hostile critics ask him to meet them and discuss these Scriptures. Certainly not; why should he? He is quite comfortable, and quite safe in his walled city, where he has his life to live and his work to do. Is it because there is no breach left in the wall that they ask him to meet them in one of the villages? But he is doing a great work so that he cannot come down. Why should the work cease while he leaves it to come down to them?[1] They threaten to attack his fortress and drive him out of it. But their weapons are not quite of the kind for this warfare. By all means let them seek others, read history and philosophy, study the Church's foundations and her wondrous superstructure, confer with her master builders. Peradventure the issue will be that they will themselves see the only place of safety to be within her walls.

---

[8] 'Romanist writers admit the sufficiency of Scripture for the proof at least of all the Articles in the three creeds.' Dr. Hawkins, *Bampton Lectures*, 1840, p. 317. On the general question of Tradition and the Interpretation of Scripture, which is quite another question from that of the Canon and the Church which is noticed in the text above, the younger student may perhaps be referred to this standard treatise by Dr. Hawkins, especially to the notes; to the *Bampton Lectures* of Bishop van Mildert, 1815, to those of Mr. W. D. Conybeare, 1839; and to Dr. Salmon's recent work, *Infallibility of the Church*, 1888. And for a fuller discussion, to the works of H. J. Holtzmann, *Kanon und Tradition*, 1859; and Tanner (a Romanist), *Ueber das katholische Traditions- und das protestantische Schrift-Princip*, 1862.

The inner witness.

Another answer which in more or less definite language would be not unfrequently given, may be stated in terms like these:—

'I believe on other grounds than those contained in the Bible that God exists, and if He exists it is *a priori* probable that He will reveal Himself to man. There are other revelations of God, as in nature or in history, but the revealed word of God is the full utterance of the Creator to the creature. The Bible comes to me with the attestation of prophecy and miracle and history, but the ultimate test of the word of God to me is, that it is a word of God to me. It finds me. It tells me of a Saviour. It converts my soul. It changes my life. I take counsel with my brother man and find that his experience agrees with my own. I look at the work of missions and of Bible societies. It is quite certain that here is truth which human nature, as human nature, needs; and with which alone it is satisfied. You ask me how I know all this? How do I know light from darkness, bitter from sweet?

---

[9] 1 Tim. iii. 15.

[1] Cf. Neh. vi. 1–4.

'I say nothing about the extent or method of inspiration. That is inspiration which inspires me. That is the word of God which speaks to my soul. I would rather not draw distinctions where I reverence all; but of course I know, as all Christian people know, that there are portions of the New Testament which have an influence that others have not. The marked Bibles of devout Christians are a Bible within a Bible; the texts of a spiritual ministry are the sacred words of life. No one would place the salutations of the sixteenth chapter of the Romans, for example, side by side with the prologue to S. John. The mass of Christian experience, as expressed in biographies, letters, journals, asserts that the Fourth Gospel is a writing which most fully meets the wants of the great world of humanity. Tell the missionary to the most civilized or to the most barbarous heathendom, that he can have at present only one book of the Bible translated into their new language. Which will he choose? Tell a Christian philosopher or a Christian peasant, that he can only give one book of the Bible to his child. Which will he choose? Go to the bed-side of some poor outcast in the slum of a great city, and ask to be allowed to read to him from a book of the New Testament; endeavour to interest him by asking which is his favourite book. Which will he choose?

'No question of criticism materially affects my position. If the contents are divine, the vessel is of comparatively small importance. If the word of God is certainly spoken, it matters little in what form or by what person it is spoken.'

Such is the language of a large number of men of robust intellect, of holy and devoted lives, in our own and in other communions.

And for the man who thus believes in the inner witness as the true test of Scripture, external criticism has no point of attack.

'Come and discuss with me,' says the critic, 'whether your Scripture is divine.'

'Discuss with you that about which I am quite sure, why should I? There is no ground on which we can meet. I know my wants and what satisfies them, my life and what supports it, my inmost being and what fills it through and through.'

'But I want to show you that the data of your consciousness are not trustworthy. You are guided by feeling; I want to guide you by reason.'

'That is shifting the whole position. It is not the Fourth Gospel you wish to discuss, but human nature. I am quite content with the practical experience of my own inner life and of that of millions who have gone before and of millions who are living now. 'One thing I know, that whereas I was blind, now I see. . . . Why herein is a marvellous thing, that ye know not from whence he is, and yet he hath opened mine eyes. . . . If this man were not of God, he could do nothing.' '[2]

Verbal inspiration.

A third answer, which I find more difficulty in expressing because I have seldom known men who consistently hold it, though not a few profess it; and because I do not know any standard work of any English body of Christians which declares it, is that of verbal inspiration. It is not inconsistent with, and as a matter of fact is sometimes held in conjunction with, either of the previous theories; though it can be held by a loyal child of the Church who accepts her authority only together with the conviction that the Church herself holds it. A man who gives this answer might use much of the language which we have just supposed others to use, but he would add:—

'When I speak of the Scriptures, I mean the whole Scriptures, the Bible and nothing but the Bible.[3] I understand the language of the New Testament to teach me the sacredness of every jot and tittle of the Old Testament, and to promise me a like full and infallible, verbally, literally inspired word of God. I mean that every statement and circumstance, scientific and historical as well as doctrinal, is necessarily and exactly true. If modern science and history and literature disagree with any of these statements, so much the worse for modern science and history and literature.[4] I accept the Gospel according to S. John, just as I accept the Epistle of S. Jude. I do not trouble myself with details of criticism or of authenticity, nor do I care much for questions of text or translation. I take my fathers' English Bible, which has come to me in the providence of God, as the absolutely sacred and absolutely perfect word of God, the unerring guide and chart of my life. The Holy Spirit who dictated it will protect it and will interpret it.'

---

[2] John ix. 25, 30, 33.

[3] Cf. a striking lecture on 'William Chillingworth' by Dean Plumptre, in *Masters in English Theology*, 1877, pp. 113–145.

Perhaps this state of thought and feeling is not often expressed in definite forms of language; but it lies at the root of no small portion of the less educated, it may be, but not the less real religious life and activities of this and other countries.

The man who believes in this mechanical verbal inspiration of Holy Scriptures must admit that discoveries in science, and investigations of history, and the whole development of modern criticism, have made his position, to say the least, exceedingly difficult; but he must defend himself. We shall see that his theory is no part of the 'judgment of centuries,' no part of the Church's judgment at all.

---

[4] 'Wer will wagen, die Autorität eines Copernicus über die des heiligen Geistes zu stellen?' Calovius; see Herzog-Plitt, *Real-Encyklopädie*, iii. p. 76.

Canons of historical and literary criticism.

One more answer would come to us from so many persons of high culture and attainment, that it would deserve the most careful attention at our hands. This answer is also not inconsistent with some of the language which we have already considered, and as a matter of fact often co-exists with it:—

'The Fourth Gospel,' one of these persons would say, 'must be judged primarily just as any other writing would be, by the ordinary canons of literary evidence and criticism, and I accept it because it satisfies those canons. I have this difficulty about the authority of the Church taken absolutely alone—it may be the best authority for the masses, and I have not a word to say against it—but for myself, as a critic accustomed to weigh evidence, there is the difficulty that I am asked to accept the Fourth Gospel and other Scriptures on the authority of the Church, and the Church on the authority of the Scriptures. The world rests upon the elephant, and the elephant rests upon the tortoise; the tortoise cannot then rest upon the world. The argument is not free from the vice of the circle.

'And I have this difficulty about the inner witness—that it varies with the individual. For example, if I were making for my own edification a Canon of the writings which were read in the Church in the early centuries, I should include the Epistle of Clement or the letter to the Laodiceans or the Epistle to Diognetus, rather than the Second Epistle of S. Peter or the Epistle of S. Jude. If I were drawing the line between the Canonical and the apocryphal books of the Old Testament, I should value the wondrous teaching of the book of Wisdom more highly than some of the records of the books of Chronicles. If I am to think indeed of the Fourth Gospel only, the inner witness has been so unanimous, and the verification in the life of humanity so unique, that I am bound, regarding them merely as historical phenomena which stand quite alone, to accept the evidence as conclusive. Still my general position is, that this writing is to be judged as every other writing ; and I accept it as the authentic work of S. John because this is the only theory which explains all the complicated facts of the case. It is not free from difficulty—but no question of historical criticism of the first or second century is, or can be—and it is infinitely more free from difficulty than any other theory which has been suggested to explain the same facts. As a mere question of history and criticism, and writing for writing, altogether apart from the contents, I have much more reason to accept the Fourth Gospel as the work of the Apostle, than I have to accept the histories of Herodotus or Thucydides or Xenophon, of Tacitus or Livy or Cæsar,[5] as genuine documents. And if I am convinced that it is the work of the Apostle, it follows that it is an authentic record of the life and teaching of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the fullest spiritual truth which can be presented to the soul.'

---

[5] It is, of course, generally known, but it is not always remembered, that while the great Uncial MSS. of the New Testament date from the fourth to the sixth, and the Versions and text can be traced to the second and third centuries, there is no known

The man who gives this answer would of course feel that any challenge of criticism must be met upon its own ground; that the wounds of reason can be healed only by reason; that the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel is a question of history and evidence and not one of dogma; that the witness and keeping of the Church is a fact of first importance; that the consciousness of humanity is a fact of first importance, but that these facts are to take their place with all others; that the objections of critics cannot be met in the nineteenth century as Tertullian met the objections of heretics in the second century by *prescription* or *demurrer*; but that the whole case must be brought into open court and tried at the bar of justice and truth, with acknowledged experts as judges, and for a jury honest men who will shape their verdict by the evidence alone.

These general remarks upon the way in which the

---

manuscript of Herodotus or of Thucydides earlier than the tenth, nor of Xenophon earlier than from the eleventh to the thirteenth centuries. There is no reference in existing literature to Thucydides, the chief authority for the history of Greece, for two centuries after his death. See Polybius, *Hist.* viii. 13; ed. Bekker, 1844, vol. i. p. 578.

Nor are the Latin classical histories better attested. The first six books of the *Annals* of Tacitus, for example, depend upon one manuscript, which was written not earlier than the ninth century, and was discovered in Westphalia in the sixteenth century.

question now presents itself will help us to understand the principles upon which this and other sacred writings have been received at different periods in the history of the Church.

Treatment of question in Apostolic age:

In the Apostolic age, if we may draw conclusions from the New Testament itself, there is no traceable idea of any new collection of writings for the use of the Church. The only hint of a word having been written by our Lord's hand, is of a writing upon the sand of the floor; and there is no suggestion that He directed His disciples to write. Nor is there in the special gifts of the Spirit to the Church, the *charismata* which were to qualify men for the service which God called them to render to mankind —many and varied though they were—any reference to writing or qualifications for authorship. The terms used in the history of the promulgation of the Gospel and the foundation of the Church never include the idea of writing, and they express every cognate idea so fully that they must be taken to exclude it. We read of 'proclaiming good news,' of 'preaching,' of 'exhorting,' of 'speaking,' of 'hearing,' of 'testifying,' of 'handing down'; of 'the Gospel,' of 'the Word,' of 'tradition,' of 'witness,' of 'the opening of the mouth'; of 'the preacher,' of 'the evangelist,' of 'the missionary.'[6] S. Paul's question is: 'How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed?

Terms used.

---

[6] Cf. Reuss, *Geschichte der heiligen Schriften*, Neues Testament, ed. 6, § 36.

and how shall they believe in him whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?' And his answer is, 'So belief cometh of hearing, and hearing by the Word of Christ.'

Oral tradition and writings.

It does not appear that any one of the writers of the New Testament thought of his writing as one which would become of general use in the Church, or would be read apart from the oral teaching which had been already communicated, and which formed the substance of the 'faith once delivered to the saints.' No writing is addressed to persons to whom the truth was not otherwise known. Many of the writings are largely personal, and those intended for public reading were for individual churches, and for churches connected with them, and with the writer.

Reasons why early Church did not provide a Canon.

So far from setting before themselves the task of providing Scriptures for a future Church, there is no evidence that any of the Apostolic writers expected that there would be a Church on earth far beyond the generation in which they themselves lived. For them, the sacred Scriptures are the writings of Moses and of the Prophets. They would have shrunk, with the reverence of Jews, from placing their own writings by the side of the closed Canon of the Old Testament. The only clear instance[7] in which the term 'Scripture' is applied in the New Testament to any part of the New Testament itself, is in the Second Epistle of S. Peter,[8] where reference is made to a collection of Pauline Epistles; and your knowledge will prevent your laying too much stress upon this passage. No part of the New Testament is quoted in the New Testament, as an authority for a fact or for a doctrinal statement. S. John must have been acquainted with some form of one or more of the earlier Gospels, of portions of the Acts of the Apostles, of the teaching of S. Peter and S. Paul, especially, as his writings show, with the Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, and Timothy; but he never quotes or refers to them in the Fourth Gospel or in his Epistles. They were not to him Scriptures. S. Paul more than once appeals to a fact of the Gospel history, and does so as late as the Second Epistle to Timothy, but the reference is not made to any writing, but to 'my Gospel,' that is, to his own oral teaching of the truth.[9]

---

[7] A friendly critic invites my attention to 1 Tim. v. 18, 'For the scripture saith, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn. And, The labourer is worthy of his reward,' as another instance, and one which disproves my assertion. But a careful study will show that it is exactly in accord with the asser-

New Testament not regarded as 'Scripture.'

In the post-Apostolic age

And as it was in the age of the Apostles, so was it also in the generation which immediately followed. There is comparatively little of formal quotation from the New Testament Scriptures in any of the Apostolic Fathers. Sentences and words occur, some of which

---

tion. The term 'scripture' is applied to the quotation, if it be one—cf. Alford's note *in loco*—from the Old Testament, and is not applied in the immediate context, even to the word of the Lord Himself.

[8] 2 Peter iii. 16.

[9] εὐαγγέλιόν μου· 2 Tim. ii. 8. Cf. Rom. ii. 16; xvi. 25.

are so exactly parallel as to make it impossible to believe that the writers were not making definite reference to our present Canonical Scriptures of the New Testament. I have elsewhere referred to the fact that the Johannine current of thought coloured the teaching and wording of the *Didache*, of Barnabas, of Clement, of Ignatius, of the Shepherd; though it did not leave the writer's hands until the stream of traditional teaching and of the synoptic Gospels was already full and strong.[1] But while we have this evidence of the existence of the Gospels, they are not quoted by name, they are not quoted as authorities, they are quoted together with an oral traditional Gospel, and perhaps together with written Gospels which are not now extant. It will be remembered that there are several sayings of our Lord known, which do not occur in any Canonical writing.[2] On the other hand, the Old Testament Scriptures are quoted as they are in the New Testament; that is, in the circle of the Apostolic Fathers as in the circle of the Apostles, it is the Old Testament and not the New Testament which is definitely regarded as Scripture,[3] as the 'word of the Lord.'[4]

Johannine influence.

---

[1] Cf. Lecture II. p. 101; and Lecture VII. p. 402.

[2] Cf. Westcott, *Introduction to the Gospels*, Appendix C; and especially Von Gebhardt und Harnack, *Texte und Untersuchungen*, Bd. v. Heft 4. Resch, *Agrapha Aussercanonische Evangelienfragmente*, 1889.

[3] The passage in Polycarp, cap. xii., which is referred to by Bishop Wordsworth in his note on 1 Tim. v. 18, is primarily a quotation of the LXX Version of Ps. iv. 4.

[4] 'The title the Word of God, though common afterwards, and especially in modern times, is

Reference to the 'Word of the Lord.'

But in the Apostolic period there had already grown up quite naturally by the side of the 'word of the Lord,' contained in the Old Testament, the custom of referring to the word of the Lord Jesus Christ. He was the Lord. He was the Word. What He said was the very word of God. The Apostles could not place their own words as authoritative by the side of the Old Testament Scriptures; but these sacred Scriptures were fulfilled in Him. 'The word of the Lord endureth for ever: and this is the word which by the Gospel is preached unto you.'[5]

Again, the Apostolic period gives a rule of practice to that which followed it. In the post-Apostolic age, when the current of oral teaching in individual churches was vigorous, and had been strengthened by evangelic records and letters; and now above all when the tradition of the Ephesian church had been perfected by the Fourth Gospel, and communion between the churches was being established, and ecclesiastical literature was putting forth its first efforts, the constant appeal is made to the 'word of the Lord,' to the 'commands of the Lord,' to 'thus saith the

Examples.

---

never used as a title of Scripture generally by any of the New Testament writers. No quotation is headed "As it is written in the Word of God," "What saith the Word of God?" &c. No statement concerning Scripture is introduced by mention of this title. Yet it is a phrase used, in one or other of its many forms, some hundred times in all, and clearly, therefore, could not have been omitted as a title of Scripture except on the ground that in the Apostles' days it was not so applied.' Warington, *Inspiration*, 1867, p. 46. Cf. the valuable *Appendix*, pp. 273–8.

[5] 1 Peter i. 25.

Lord.' It will be remembered how emphatically this is the case in the two works which are connected with the name of the Eastern archbishop, Bryennios, the so-called *Second Epistle of Clement*, and the *Didache*. The latter writing is, indeed, entitled '*The Teaching of the Lord, by means of the Twelve Apostles*.'[6] We have seen that the five books of Papias are called '*Expositions of the Sayings of the Lord*,'[7] and that in Justin the *Memoirs of the Apostles*[8] are quoted for their constant reference to the sayings of the Lord. The few lines from Papias which are preserved in Eusebius are of special interest in illustrating the thought of the post-Apostolic Church. He seeks 'not for foreign precepts, but for those which are given from the Lord to our faith,' and tells us that he 'did not profit so much from books as'—and the phrase is very remarkable—'from the living and abiding voice.'[9] That is his comment, as it is S. Peter's comment, on the text, 'The word of the Lord endureth for ever.' It is the living voice, the voice of the Lord in the Church, 'the word which by the gospel is preached unto you,' which abideth for ever.

Individual churches

This means, and the study of the Apostolic Fathers and of the fragments preserved in Eusebius and writings.

---

[6] 'Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων' καὶ 'Διδαχὴ Κυρίου διὰ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.' Ed. Bryennios, 1883, p. 2.

[7] *Λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξήγησις.* Cf. Lecture II. p. 96.

[8] Cf. *ibid.* pp. 65 sqq.

[9] *παρὰ ζώσης φωνῆς καὶ μενούσης.* *Hist. Eccles.* iii. 39. But cf. Zahn's interpretation of these words, *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons*, 1889, Bd. i. p. 866.

will serve to remind us, that the Church in the first vigour of her life felt no need for, and had no cause to form, a Canon of her writings. The writings, let us bear in mind, were to a considerable extent the property of individual churches. Some of the Epistles contained references to matters of a private and not always very creditable nature; some contained special injunctions which had no meaning for other churches; some contained injunctions to individual persons. Nor did all churches at first possess, or perhaps care to possess, copies of all the Gospels. Each church had its own founder, its own present teachers, its own special characteristics, its own oral Gospel, in some cases its own Apostolic Epistle. The Catholicity and corporate life of the whole Church had from the first existed in idea; but to work it out in practice was still in the future. No one who knows the history of the Church in the post-Apostolic age will demand a Canon of her writings at that period; and the apologist who attempts to answer the demand is doing no true service to the writings or to the Church. There were canons of the churches, rather than a Canon of the Church, side by side with the 'living voice,' and the 'word of the Lord.' The Canonicity of the New Testament could not be, until the Catholicity of the Church was. The first framers of a Canon, and the first who largely quoted the Scriptures of the New Testament, were not the Catholics, but the heretics. The Church had no need to quote them. She had her full living voice

Idea of a Catholic Church not yet realized.

A Catholic Canon becomes necessary.

and her teachers to whom she could appeal in case of doubt or difficulty. But when the Gnostics and other heretics quoted texts of the Church's writings, and adduced other writings in support of their own views; and when they alleged a secret traditional interpretation by which even the writings of the churches were made to support their heresies, the churches were driven to the task of comparing and deciding upon their own Apostolical books; and the Church was obliged to draw up her Canon and her own traditional interpretation, her rule of faith, her first forms of creed, by which the meaning of these books should be fixed.

The materials of the Canon in the second century, then, were, the tradition of the Church in her living voice, the written evangelic statements of the words of the Lord, the Apostolic letters, the records of Apostolic teaching in the Acts, and the prophetic Revelation of S. John.

The Canon a question of history

The fundamental principle was to ascertain what was truly the word of the Lord Jesus. This did not necessarily imply any writing. As late as Irenæus, who thinks of the four-fold Gospel as consonant with the natural order of things, it is still possible to conceive of a Church without a Bible, but not of a Bible without a Church.[1] But with this tradition, there not of dogma.

---

[1] 'Quid autem si neque Apostoli quidem Scripturas reliquissent nobis, nonne oportebat ordinem sequi traditionis, quam tradiderunt iis quibus committebant ecclesias? Cui ordinationi assentiunt multæ gentes barbarorum eorum qui in Christum credunt, sine charta vel atramento scriptam habentes per Spiritum in

was the exercise of judgment upon the writings. Did the so-called Gospels come from the earliest direct sources of knowledge, that is, were they immediately or mediately Apostolic? Were the other writings from Apostolic sources? The acceptance of a writing did not rest upon the decree of any council, for the time of councils was not yet. The Canon was a question of history, not one of dogma; and churches might differ, and did differ, and Fathers of the Church might differ from each other, and sometimes be inconsistent with themselves—and did differ and were inconsistent—as to the use of the doubtful books or the exact principle on which a book should be received. Tradition, but tradition critically tested in the presence of heresy, was the first formative principle of the Canon. The New Testament was the child of the Church.

In the third and fourth centuries,

As we pass from the second century onwards, we find that the current of tradition flowed necessarily in wider channels, but with less fulness and force. Men were no longer in the presence of those who had themselves known the immediate descendants of Apostles; and with the growth of Christian literature there came the fuller power of criticism, and the wider opportunities for exercising it. And there were

---

cordibus suis salutem, et veterem traditionem diligenter custodientes.' Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* iii. 4, 1; ed. Harvey, tom. ii. p. 16. Cf. the valuable collection of authorities in Tanner, *Ueber das katholische Traditions- u. das protestantische Schrift-Princip*, pp. 4–8.

giants in those days. The sacred books stood out more and more prominently, as the presence of the original tradition was less fully felt, and they became the centres round which that tradition was deposited in continuous expositions and commentaries. The tradition of the second century became in the third and following centuries, one with the sacred Scriptures. Witness the commentaries and homilies of Origen, Cyprian, Augustine, Jerome, Basil, Chrysostom, the Gregorys of Nyssa and Nazianzus, and the Cyrils of Jerusalem and Alexandria.

tradition one with Scriptures.

There is no fallacy of the vicious circle then in the paradox which is simply historical truth, that the Scriptures depend upon the Church, and the Church depends upon the Scriptures. The relation of the mutual dependence varied in different circumstances. There is a young mother carrying her boy who cannot yet walk alone. Years pass on. There is a woman leaning upon the arm of a strong man whose strength has been born of her and now supports her. It is the same mother; the same child.

The Scriptures depend on the Church, the Church on the Scriptures.

How rapidly the sacred Scriptures of the New Testament became part of the daily life of the Church, and how precious men held them to be, we recognize as early as the Diocletian persecution at the opening of the fourth century, when they chose to die rather than to part with them; and how fully tradition continued to hold its place side by side with the Bible, as late as the close of the century, is seen in the declaration of Augustine,

Testimony of

Augustine,

'I would not believe the Gospel unless the authority of the Church should move me thereto.'[2] Here we have language than which none could be more plain, and it by no means stands alone, in which Scripture is made to depend absolutely upon the authority of the Church. While the same Father declares also—and, again, the language by no means stands alone—that 'all things necessary to faith and morals are comprised in the sacred Scriptures,' and 'that the Christian system will come to an end if the authority of these writings is allowed to waver.'[3]

and Jerome.

Jerome, to take another example, when speaking of the Epistle to the Hebrews, illustrates in this way the general principle :—

> It does not matter who the author is as long as he is a son of the Church, and it is approved by being read in the daily lessons. But if the custom of the Latins does not receive it among the sacred and Canonical books, and the Greeks do not receive the Apocalypse, yet we receive both, for we are not careful to adapt ourselves to the custom of the present, but to follow the authority of the ancients.[4]

---

[2] 'Ego vero Evangelio non crederem, nisi me catholicæ ecclesiæ commoveret auctoritas.' *Contra Epist. Manich.—Fundam.*—cap. v. ; ed. Migne, tom. viii. p. 176.

[3] 'In iis enim quæ aperte in Scripturis posita sunt, inveniuntur illa omnia quæ continent fidem, moresque vivendi, spem scilicet atque charitatem.' . . *De Doctr. Christ.* ii. 9 ; ed. Migne, p. 42. 'Per fidem enim ambulamus, non per speciem ; titubabit autem fides, si divinarum Scripturarum vacillat auctoritas : porro fide titubante, charitas etiam ipsa languescit.' *Ibid.* i. 37 ; ed. Migne, p. 35.

[4] *Ep. ad Dardanum.* 'Et nihil interesse, cujus sit, quum Ecclesiastici viri sit, et quotidie Ecclesiarum lectione celebretur. Quod si eam Latinorum consuetudo non recipit inter Scripturas canonicas ; nec Græcorum quidem Ecclesiæ apocalypsin Joannis eadem libertate suscipiunt ; et tamen nos utramque suscipimus ; nequaquam

We have seen that for the East the Canon was practically closed at the councils of Laodicea and Constantinople, and for the West at the councils of Hippo and Carthage.[5]

Canon accepted on authority of the

From that time to the Reformation—that is, for a period, in round numbers, of nine hundred years—there was no fresh investigation of the authority, almost no fresh interpretation of the substance of the Scriptures. They were the years of *Catenæ*, of *Postillæ*, of commentaries, of compilations, which consisted of little more than of extracts from the Western Fathers, especially from Augustine, Jerome, Ambrose, Hilary. The Canon was now not a question of historical investigation, but a dogma of the Church. From the time of Gregory the Great onwards, the pope was in effect the authority of the Canon throughout Western Christendom.

Church until the Reformation.

It is customary to speak of the earlier centuries of this period as the *Dark Ages*; on many departments of literature and thought they certainly shed no light. They make little addition to our knowledge of the Bible. They received both the Scriptures and the interpretation of them, as the earlier centuries handed them down, without venturing to question either; but their sons lived the lessons which they received, with unhesitating faith, and in the spirit of absolute devotion. And what deeds they wrought

Acceptance in the *Dark Ages*.

---

hujus temporis consuetudinem, sed veterum Scriptorum auctoritatem sequentes, qui plerumque utriusque abutuntur testimoniis' . . . *Epist.* cxxix.; *Opera*, ed. Veronæ, 1734, tom. i. 965 B.

[5] Cf. *supra*, pp. 121 and 123.

by faith! These were the ages of missionaries, of the great religious orders, of crusades, of schoolmen. These ages founded monasteries and builded cathedrals. These ages established schools such as there were at Jarrow and York and Bec; universities at Oxford, Cambridge, Bologna, Paris. These ages witnessed in their darkest years lives such as those of Bæda and Alcuin, and as the light dawned it shone upon Anselm, Roscelin, Abelard, Peter Lombard, John of Salisbury, Alexander de Hales, Bonaventura, Albertus Magnus, Roger Bacon, Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus, William of Ockham, Bradwardine. If it is night, there are at least many bright stars in the firmament. It would be an interminable task to seek to trace the influence of the Fourth Gospel during this period. Where all were received, and the Gospels more than all, the Fourth Gospel was most of all. If here and there a critical spirit, like Hugo of S. Victor, or Abelard, raises the question, it is never to do other than honour to S. John.[6]

Fourth Gospel received above all.

Altered view of Scriptures at the

The position of the sacred Scriptures was not the primary question of the Reformation, but the struggle with Rome soon led to the seeking and the finding of an authority independent of the Roman church.

---

[6] A full and able account of the general position of the Holy Scriptures in history is furnished in Professor Ladd's *Doctrine of Sacred Scripture*, 2 vols. 1883, and in the same writer's *What is the Bible?* New York, 1888. They are a valuable addition to other and better-known works, for the student who reads not without knowledge and thought.

Reformation.

There had been signs of an altered view of the Scriptural position in reformers before the Reformation, and this found a striking expression in the work of Bodenstein of Carlstadt.[7] His principle is critical and historical, and he is as wholly opposed to the unhesitating acceptance on the authority of pope or church, as he is to Luther's test of subjective consciousness. He has three orders of rank. In the first he would place the Pentateuch—though he does not accept the Mosaic authorship—and the Gospels; in the second, the Jewish Prophets and the fifteen Epistles; in the third, the Jewish Hagiographa and the seven Antilegomena of the New Testament. He would exclude even from the Apocrypha, the third and fourth books of Esdras, Baruch, Manasseh, and portions of Daniel.

Bodenstein of Carlstadt, 1481–1541.

Luther's own views are expressed in different passages in his works, especially in the prefaces to individual books; and although the expressions were modified as years passed on, they remain, as a whole, a definite outspoken assertion of his absolute right to judge for himself what was and was not sacred Scripture:—

Luther, 1483–1546.

> What does not teach Christ, that is not Apostolic, whether it be S. Peter or S. Paul who teaches it; but, on the other hand, what preaches Christ that is Apostolic, whether it be Judas, Annas, Pilate or Herod who teaches it.[8]

---

[7] *De Canonicis Scripturis*, 1520, 4to; best ed. in Credner, *Zur Geschichte des Kanons*, pp. 291–412; published also in shorter form for popular use, *Welche Bücher heilig und biblisch seind*, 1520.

[8] *Preface to the Epistle of S.*

Or let us take this view of the subjective reception of God's word :—

> It is true it is all God's Word. But with God's Word here and God's Word there, I must know and consider to whom the Word of God is spoken. We are a long way still from the certainty that you are the people with whom God has spoken.[9]

For Luther, that is, as for the Church of the first generations, the Canon is a Canon of the word of the Lord, and a writing is sacred and inspired just in proportion to the measure in which it contains that word. His test is the preaching of Christ, but of this he is himself the judge.

Applying his test, he declares in his preface to the New Testament of 1524 :—

> To sum up, St. John's Gospel and his first Epistle, St. Paul's Epistles, especially those to the Romans, Galatians, Ephesians, and St. Peter's first Epistle—these are the books that will show thee Christ and teach thee all that is necessary and blessed, though thou never more seest or hearest any other book or doctrine. St. James's Epistle is therefore a right strawy Epistle, since it has no kind of Gospel.[1]

Calvin, 1509–1564.

The subjective position of Calvin is equally definite, though at first he accepted the traditional view. He says :—

> Many are in this pernicious error, that the Scripture has only that importance which is given to it by the consent of the Church, as if the eternal and immutable truth of God was founded upon the pleasure of men. . . . And as concerns their question how do we know that the Scripture

---

James and S. Jude, 1522; *Werke*, ed. Walch, 1744, xiv. pp. 148 sqq.

[9] *Werke*, ed. Walch, iii. p. 14.

[1] *Ibid.* xiv. p. 105.

proceeds from God, if we do not have recourse to the decree of the Church, it is just as if anyone should ask us how we learn to discern light from darkness, white from black, sour from sweet.[2]

Zwingli is not less positive :—

Zwingli, 1484–1531.

> Whoever asserts that the Gospel is nothing without the patronage and approval of the Church, errs and blasphemes against God.[3]

Council of Trent, 1546.

Meanwhile the council of Trent had taken its unhappy step, April 8, 1546, of canonizing all the books of the Vulgate, including the Apocrypha, basing the decision upon the usage of the Church, making all books of equal value, and anathematizing all who did not accept the decree.

We are now concerned with these questions only as they affect the Fourth Gospel, and we will not pause to recall the history of the council, nor the strong differences of opinion on this subject in the council itself, and among Roman theologians without. Still less is it needful to recall the fact that the Anglican reformers were happily guided to avoid the extremes of both Rome and Geneva.

Infallibility of Scripture substituted

One step was possible more fatal even than that of Trent, or the extremest position of a subjective decision. It was to declare the fallible, infallible; the imperfect, perfect; the human, divine. The Reformation had cast to the winds the claims to human infallibility as the outer form of the divine for infallibility of the Church.

---

[2] *Institutiones*, 1559, lib. i. cap. vii. p. 14.

[3] Thesis for Conference at Zürich, 1523; *Werke*, ed. Schuler u. Schulthess, 1828, Bd. i. pp. 175–179.

infallibility of the Church; but all her children had not learnt her truest lessons, and for the infallibility of man they substituted the infallibility of a book. Scripture became, in the period from A.D. 1600–1750, —first in the reformed churches, later in the Lutheran, then in general public opinion—identical with the word of the Lord. It was a new departure in the history of the Bible. You see what a weapon it gave the Protestant against the church of Rome. You see what a weapon it gave him against the sceptics. An infallible divine writing, the inspiration extending to words, letters, the Hebrew vowel-points,[4] the Greek breathings.[5] The interpretation still remained, but the spirit and the need which replaced one infallibility by another quickly replaced one tradition by another. *Regulæ fidei*, Confessions, Articles, Institutes, Bodies of Divinity sprung up on all sides, and became almost as sacred as the Scriptures themselves.

---

[4] 'In specie autem Hebraicus Veteris Testamenti Codex, quem ex traditione Ecclesiæ Judaicæ, cui olim Oracula Dei commissa sunt (Rom. iii. 2), accepimus hodieque retinemus, tum quoad consonas, tum quoad vocalia, sive puncta ipsa, sive punctorum saltem potestatem, et tum quoad res, tum quoad verba θεόπνευστος, ut fidei et vitæ nostræ, una cum codice Novi Testamenti sit Canon unicus et illibatus, ad cujus normam, ceu Lydium lapidem, universæ, quæ extant, Versiones, sive orientales, sive occidentales exigendæ, et sicubi deflectunt, revocandæ sunt.' *Formula Consensus Helvetica.* Canon ii. Augusti, *Corpus Librorum Symbolicorum*, 1827, pp. 445–6.

[5] 'It is impious and profane audacity to change a single point in the Word of God, and to substitute a smooth breathing for a rough one or a rough for a smooth.' Calovius quoted in Ladd, *The Doctrine of Sacred Scripture*, vol. ii. p. 190.

This infallibility attacked by modern criticism.

A weapon against the Roman! a weapon against the sceptic! but it was a two-edged sword, and none suffered such fearful wounds as those who essayed to wield it. It is against this modern human structure that the science and criticism and history of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries have directed their shafts and pierced it through and through. And men thought they were destroying the divine. Little blame to them; little blame to anyone; but tears of pity that men should raise their own puny defences and call them God's, and that other men should mistake these human frailties for divine realities. He sitteth in the fortress of the eternal truth which needs no buttress of human building; which men indeed have sometimes dared to attack, but as they have drawn nigh, they have gazed upon its wondrous strength and beauty, and have been led in humblest submission to yield themselves to the King.

Verbal inspiration, a new departure.

I have called this identification of Scripture with the word of God, this view of a mechanical, verbal, literal inspiration—for though I am seeking to avoid technical terms it is not possible to do so—a new departure, because the Church had never, has never, accepted it. Is it necessary to show that the Anglican communion has never done so? Her formularies and the works of her Fathers are in your hands. Let me but quote a statement from one of her trusted living teachers, whose nomination to the bishopric of Durham during the last week has been

Opinions of

received with a harmonious chorus of thanksgiving in which there is no discordant voice :—

Dr. Westcott,

> The purely organic theory of Inspiration rests on no Scriptural authority, and, if we except a few ambiguous metaphors, is supported by no historical testimony. It is at variance with the whole form and fashion of the Bible, and is destructive of all that is holiest in man, and highest in Religion, which seeks the co-ordinate elevation of all our faculties, and not the destruction of any one of them.[6]

Bishop of Carlisle,

And let me remind you of the caution of one of her living Bishops, spoken in a Hulsean Lecture now thirty-five years ago :—

> And indeed it is a question worthy of solemn consideration, whether almost as much mischief has not been done to the cause of Christian faith, by those who have endeavoured to force upon their brethren untenable views of the nature of Holy Scriptures, as by those who have rudely treated them as merely human books.[7]

Cardinal Newman,

That the Roman communion has never fully decreed this doctrine, even in the fatal steps of Trent and the Vatican, may be gathered from the following words of Cardinal Newman :—

> These two councils [the Tridentine and the Vatican] decide that the Scriptures are inspired, and inspired throughout, but not inspired by an immediately divine act, but through the instrumentality of inspired men ; that they are inspired in all matters of faith and morals, meaning thereby, not only theological doctrine, but also the historical and prophetical narratives which they contain, from Genesis to the Acts of the Apostles ; and lastly, that, being inspired because

---

[6] Westcott, *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, ed. 4, p. 6.

[7] Bishop of Carlisle, then Mr. Harvey Goodwin, Hulsean Lectures, 1855, pp. 79–80.

written by inspired men, they have a human side, which manifests itself in language, style, tone of thought, character, intellectual peculiarities, and such infirmities, not sinful, as belong to our nature, and which in unimportant matters may issue in what in doctrinal definitions is called an *obiter dictum*.[8]

In a word, Inspiration of Scripture in omnibus *suis partibus* is one thing; in omnibus *rebus* is another.[9]

Bishop of Amycla,

This opinion of Cardinal Newman is supported by a recent utterance of the Bishop of Amycla, assistant to the Archbishop of Westminster :—

> Catholics are under no sort of obligation to believe that inspiration extends to the words of Holy Scripture as well as to the subject-matter which is therein contained.[1]

Richard Baxter, 1615–1691,

That English Protestants did not always think it necessary to accept the view of verbal infallibility, and that they did not shrink from teaching what they held, is proved by the following words from Richard Baxter's *Catechising of Families*, and his opinion is by no means singular :—

> And here I must tell you of a great and needful truth, which ignorant Christians, fearing to confess, by over-doing, tempt men to infidelity. The Scripture is like a man's body, where some parts are but for the preservation of the rest, and may be maimed, without death: the sense is the soul of the Scripture, and the letters but the body or vehicle. The doctrine of the Creed, Lord's Prayer, and Decalogue, and Baptism, and Lord's Supper, is the vital part, and Christianity itself. The Old Testament letter (written as we have it about

---

[8] *What is of obligation for a Catholic to believe concerning the Inspiration of the Canonical Scriptures*, 1884, pp. 4, 5.

[9] *Ibid.* p. 23.

[1] *Inspiration*, reprinted from the *Homiletical Magazine*, 1884, p. 195.

Ezra's time) is that vehicle which is as imperfect as the revelation of those times was: but as after Christ's incarnation and ascension the Spirit was more abundantly given, and the revelation more perfect and sealed, so the doctrine is more full, and the vehicle or body, that is the words, are less imperfect, and more sure to us; so that he that doubts of the truth of some words in the Old Testament, or of some small circumstantials in the New, hath no reason, therefore, to doubt of the Christian religion, of which these writings are but the vehicle, or body, sufficient to ascertain us of the truth of the history and doctrine. Be sure, first, that Christ is the very Son of God, and it inferreth the certainty of all his words, and enforceth our own religion.[2]

Neander, 1789–1850.

That foreign Protestants have not thought it necessary to accept the doctrine of mechanical verbal inspiration, may be seen from the words of Neander, than whom no man has been held in higher honour by the Protestant churches of Germany, France, Holland, and America:—

It must be regarded as one of the greatest boons which the purifying process of Protestant theology in Germany has conferred upon faith as well as science, that the old, mechanical view of Inspiration has been so generally abandoned. That doctrine, and the forced harmonies to which it led, demanded a clerk-like accuracy in the evangelical accounts, and could not admit even the slightest contradictions in them; but we are now no more compelled to have recourse to subtilties against which our sense of truth rebels. In studying the historical connexion of our Saviour's life and actions by the application of an unfettered criticism, we reach a deeper sense in many of his sayings than the bonds of the old dogmatism would have allowed. The inquiring reason need no longer find its free sense of truth opposed to faith; nor is reason bound to subjugate herself, not to faith, but to arbitrary dogmas and artificial hypotheses.[3]

---

[2] *Catechising of Families*, cap. vi. question 11, answer. *Practical Works*, 1830, vol. xix. p. 32.

Result of the 'judgment of centuries.'

But it would be to no purpose to multiply quotations to establish the view which the Church in all her history has held as to the facts of the reception of the Fourth Gospel, or the principles on which that reception has been based. We have now examined both the facts and the principles, not indeed with any degree of fulness in proportion to the subject, but still with such enlargement as is possible under present circumstances. At the risk of the objection *Quis negavit*, *Quis dubitavit?* rising to many lips, I have ventured to extend our instances over a large area of known facts; and I now submit that they all converge to the induction that, with the possible exception of the Alogi,—and this exception we saw to be really unimportant, and to be such as it is in favour of the tradition of time and place and therefore to support the induction,—there has been no decade of any century of the Church's history, from the end of the second down to the end of the eighteenth century, in which the undisputed acceptance of the Fourth Gospel in the Church cannot be traced.[4] Catholics—Anglican, Roman, and Greek; Protestants—Lutheran, Reformed, Nonconforming; tradition of the Church, consciousness of the individual, history,

Comprehension exemplified in width of induction.

---

[3] *Leben Jesu Christi*, ed. 4, 1845, pp. 12, 13. Eng. Trans. 1851, pp. 8, 9.

[4] For extension of this induction to the second century, cf. Lecture II. pp. 102 sq.

criticism, the practical test of use and effect in Christendom during these hundreds of years all utter one voice. Ask whom you will, examine on what principle you will. Here is a result in which all agree. The Fourth Gospel is an Apostolic and sacred work, coming to us from S. John, in the fullest sense inspired, that is, inspired in the essence of its inner realities, but not in the accident of its external form—though some, with zeal which has outrun wisdom or knowledge, have claimed even this—and taking the very first place, if first place there be, among the Scriptures of the New Testament.

Depth of conviction.

Examples:

I have invited your attention to the width of the area of instances on which this induction is based. Let me close this lecture by asking you to consider in two instances the intensity of devotion to the Fourth Gospel and of conviction of its Apostolic authorship.

The Venerable Bede,

In the eighth century, the Monastery of Jarrow on the banks of the Tyne was one of the intellectual lights of Europe, and Bæda was the pride of England and one of the foremost scholars of Christendom. He died in the year A.D. 735. This is the closing scene of his earthly life :—

> Two weeks before the Easter of 735 the old man was seized with an extreme weakness and loss of breath. He still preserved however his usual pleasantness and gay good-humour, and in spite of prolonged sleeplessness continued his lectures to the pupils about him. Verses of his own English tongue broke from time to time from the master's

lip—rude rimes that told how before the 'need-fare,' Death's stern 'must go,' none can enough bethink him what is to be his doom for good or ill. The tears of Bæda's scholars mingled with his song. 'We never read without weeping,' writes one of them. So the days rolled on to Ascension-tide, and still master and pupils toiled at their work, for Bæda longed to bring to an end his version of St. John's Gospel into the English tongue and his extracts from Bishop Isidore. 'I don't want my boys to read a lie,' he answered those who would have had him rest, 'or to work to no purpose after I am gone.' A few days before Ascension-tide his sickness grew upon him, but he spent the whole day in teaching, only saying cheerfully to his scholars, 'Learn with what speed you may; I know not how long I may last.' The dawn broke on another sleepless night, and again the old man called his scholars round him and bade them write. 'There is still a chapter wanting,' said the scribe, as the morning drew on, 'and it is hard for thee to question thyself any longer.' 'It is easily done,' said Bæda; 'take thy pen and write quickly.' Amid tears and farewells the day wore on to eventide. 'There is yet one sentence unwritten, dear master,' said the boy. 'Write it quickly,' bade the dying man. 'It is finished now,' said the little scribe at last. 'You speak truth,' said the master; 'all is finished now.' Placed upon the pavement, his head supported in his scholars' arms, his face turned to the spot where he was wont to pray, Bæda chanted the solemn 'Glory to God.' As his voice reached the close of his song he passed quietly away.[5]

Bishop Lightfoot.

In the ninth decade of the nineteenth century—the incident is rather later in time than the logical fitness of our subject requires, but the parallel will justify its use as an illustration—in the castle of Auckland on the banks of the Wear, lived a scholar bishop of the English Church. Bishop of a populous diocese and administering it as if he lived for the diocese alone, he was, at the same time, a scholar like Bæda, surrounded by pupils loving and beloved, and living the humble student's devoted life. In the autumn of 1888, he lay sick, and, in the opinion of all who saw him and of himself, the sickness was unto death. He had long been urged by 'strangers and friends in England and America alike' to collect and reprint a series of essays which are grouped around the Fourth Gospel as a centre. But he had hoped to extend the series, and had always declined the request. And now, to use his own words, 'when I was prostrated by sickness and my life was hanging on a slender thread, it became necessary to give a final answer.'[6] His pupil and chaplain filled the office of the boy at Bæda's hand. From the very presence of death his testimony on the external evidence of the Fourth Gospel was given to the world.

---

[5] Green, *History of the English people*, 1878, i. 66 sq. Cf. *Cuthberti Epistola de Obitu Venerabilis Bedæ*; Bede's *Works*, ed. Giles, 1. clxiii–clxvi.

It pleased God for a time to restore him to some measure of strength. Hours of weakness which as we thought ought to have been claimed for rest were devoted to work. 'It is hard for thee to question thyself any longer,' said those around him. 'It is easily done,' was the constant reply. The late autumn of 1889 found him again obliged to leave his northern home. The last days were in part occupied by revising, as the hands of his chaplain copied, a lecture upon the *Internal Evidence for the Authenticity and Genuineness of St. John's Gospel* delivered eighteen years before, and now to be re-delivered with the weight of all these years of thought. 'His sickness grew upon him.' On the festival of S. Thomas he fell on sleep. On the eve of S. John the Evangelist's day his remains rested beneath the same roof with those of Cuthbert and Bede, on the festival of S. John they were committed to their resting-place in the chapel at Auckland. The lecture on S. John was the last public document to which he affixed his name, and it was given to the world from the open grave. He being dead yet speaketh. Let us hear him :—

---

[6] *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, 1889, preface, p. vii.

> Whatever consequences may follow from it, we are compelled on critical grounds to accept this Fourth Gospel as the genuine work of John the son of Zebedee. . . . As a critical question, I wish to take a verdict upon it. But as I could not have you think that I am blind to the theological issues directly or indirectly connected with it, I will close with this brief confession of faith. I believe from my heart that the truth which this Gospel more especially enshrines—the truth that Jesus Christ is the very Word incarnate, the manifestation of the Father to mankind—is the one lesson which, duly apprehended, will do more than all our feeble efforts to purify and elevate human life here, by imparting to it hope and light and strength, the one study which alone can fitly prepare us for a joyful immortality hereafter.[7]

Such, in all the width of a *comprehension*, in all the depth of an *intension*, which I am able simply to indicate, is the 'judgment of centuries' upon the Fourth Gospel.

---

[7] *Expositor*, March 1890, p. 188.

Next term we will inquire into the judgments of 'our age' and consider how far they have cancelled it.

LECTURE IV

‘OUR AGE’

EVANSON. BRETSCHNEIDER. STRAUSS

'WITHOUT DOUBT HUMAN TESTIMONY IS TO BE DULY AND STRICTLY SIFTED, AND EVERY DEFECT IN ITS QUANTITY OR QUALITY IS TO BE RECORDED IN THE SHAPE OF A DEDUCTION FROM ITS WEIGHT. BUT AS THERE IS NO PROCEEDING MORE IRREVERENT, SO THERE IS NONE MORE STRICTLY IRRATIONAL, THAN ITS WHOLESALE DEPRECIATION. SUCH DEPRECIATION IS AN INFALLIBLE NOTE OF SHALLOW AND CARELESS THINKING, FOR IT VERY GENERALLY IMPLIES AN EXAGGERATED AND ALMOST LUDICROUS ESTIMATE OF THE CAPACITY AND PERFORMANCES OF THE PRESENT GENERATION, AS COMPARED WITH THOSE WHICH HAVE PRECEDED IT.'

Gladstone.

LECTURE IV.

Is there a thing whereof men say, See, this is new? it hath been already, in the ages which were before us.—Eccles. i. 10.

Criticism of 'our age.'

In the earlier lectures of this course we have endeavoured to estimate the 'judgment of centuries' on the authorship of the Fourth Gospel. It remains for us to consider the criticism of 'our age,' which is said to have cancelled it. That it should be so cancelled is *a priori* not impossible, but if the facts and the arguments to which I have invited your attention have any real force, it is in a high degree improbable. The convictions of the past may be wholly wrong; but we are bound to demand proof of this, and those who assert it have no right to feel aggrieved, if strength and frequency of assertion are not accepted in the place of proof. Still less have they any right to feel aggrieved if, when some among them condescend to personal attack upon their opponents, the opinion of bystanders should be, in accord with the legal maxim, that they have no case. If 'our age' has come to the knowledge of new facts, let them be adduced. If new inductions from old facts have been established, let the inductions and the processes by which they have been arrived at, be stated. It will not produce conviction to tell us in general terms that all this

Assertion cannot be accepted as proof,

vast revolution has been accomplished, and that we must therefore accept the new position. We have lately read, to take an example of such statements, the following words :—

> He paused, and then very simply, and so as to be understood by those who heard him, he gave a rapid sketch of that great operation worked by the best intellect of Europe during the last half century—broadly speaking—on the facts and documents of primitive Christianity. From all sides and by the help of every conceivable instrument those facts have been investigated, and now at last the great result—'the revivified, reconceived truth—seems ready to emerge ! [1]

Now, we must necessarily inquire before we accept this assertion, 'On what array of facts is the generalization made ?' And if we are held in a momentary spell and are tempted to yield our weaker judgment to one who can speak confidently of the fifty years' work of the best intellect of Europe, and of the facts and documents of primitive Christianity, and of investigations by every conceivable instrument, the spell is soon broken when we remember that the assertion is made by a fictitious personage who represents a weak and certainly ill-informed young clergyman ; and, instead of absolute submission, we cannot help asking 'What does he know about it ?' Nor will the mere novelty which is necessary to an original essay for a young doctor's degree, or for the pages of a *Zeitschrift* waiting for the press, ingenious and interesting though it

nor yet originality.

---

[1] Mrs. Humphry Ward, *Robert Elsmere*, iii. p. 206.

often is, be as convincing to all readers as it is to the author. Originality may prove the cleverness of a writer, but it may also take from the force of his writing. The man who attempts to prove that history has all through been a mistake, and the instincts of humanity a delusion ; and expects that the one should be rewritten, and the other abandoned, in conformity with his own original essay, must not be surprised if other men do not all at once agree with him. Perhaps they will come to do so ; but some of them have read a good many such essays, and still have not been led to abandon the opinion that the world is wiser than any one man in it. Time may be naturally asked for in which to test his results, and meanwhile the crop of original essays is not likely to cease, and if he share the fate of his predecessors he may abandon the views which now seem so certain, or his own originality may be eclipsed by something more original still. The child has often stood upon its father's shoulders and has seemed to itself—but only to itself—taller than the man upon whose strength it rested. And Time's youngest child of the nineteenth century may seem to itself—but only to itself—taller than the great past on which it rests. Adults who stand and watch will smile, for Time's children have had a habit of thinking this in every age ;[2] and after

---

[2] Examples of this abound on all sides. One which is of special interest from its connexion with biblical criticism, is found in the opinion which Michaelis formed of the state of that science a hundred years ago, just before the dawn of 'our age':—

'Whenever I reflect on the year 1750, when the first edition all individual men do not grow to be so much taller in the nineteenth century than they were in the first.

Vixere fortes ante Agamemnona
Multi; sed omnes illacrymabiles
Urgentur ignotique longa
Nocte, carent quia vate sacro.[3]

Destructive criticism

Nor will the positive results of the 'judgment of centuries' be cancelled by any criticism which is

of this Introduction appeared, which I published at that time chiefly as a guide for my academical lectures, and compare it with the more complete editions of 1765, and 1777, I feel a satisfaction, and even a degree of astonishment, at the progress of learning in the present age: and as during the last ten years in particular the most rapid advances have been made in literature, the present edition of this work, which is a kind of general repository, has received a proportional increase. I candidly confess, not only that my own private knowledge at the time of my first publication was inferior to what it should and might have been, but that the performance itself was written in too much haste: and yet this very imperfect edition had the honour of being translated into English, and of undergoing a re-impression even at the time when the second much more complete edition was already published in Germany. The republic of letters is at present in possession of knowledge, of which it had no idea in the middle of this century; and I may venture to affirm, that the last-mentioned period bears the same analogy to the year 1787, as the state of infancy to that of manhood. We were unable at that time to form an adequate judgement on many important topics, and the opinions of the learned were divided on the most ancient and most valuable manuscripts . . .

'The system of biblical criticism has been placed in a new light, and reduced to a state of greater certainty: but it is unnecessary to swell the preface with a description of the treasures that have been opened, and the discoveries that have been made in this enlightened age, as they are arranged under their respective heads in the course of the present Introduction.' John David Michaelis' *Introduction to the New Testament*, Eng. Trans. by Herbert Marsh, 1793, vol. i. pt. 1; Preface to German original of ed. 4, quoted in Preface, pp. iii, iv.

[3] Hor. *Carm.* iv. 9. 25.

merely negative and destructive. There are certain broad facts of human life and history to be accounted for. If a man says, 'You are all mistaken. You are all like children in the nursery. Believe me, for I have attained to adult knowledge, and know what I am talking about; if you could only see your delusion as I see it from the higher platform on which I stand, you would abandon it in a moment. It is really absurd for people in this nineteenth century to be living in mud huts constructed without any knowledge of the elementary principles of architecture'—he must not be surprised if he finds that there is a prejudice in favour of general fact and in opposition to individual fancy. Nor must he be surprised if he is asked to show that his fuller knowledge provides not only a theory, but a practical working rule by which the past may be measured and the present be lived; and if ordinary men ask leave to remain in the mud huts of their present ignorance until the house which he would build for them has got a little beyond the plans.

not sufficient;

If, then, 'our age' is to cancel the 'judgment of centuries,' it must be by the destructive criticism of clear, consistent, measured proof that this judgment is wrong; and by the constructive criticism of a definite, established judgment, which it is prepared to substitute for that which it would destroy. How far has it hitherto succeeded in this double task with regard to the Fourth Gospel?

construction demanded.

Evanson, 1731–1805.

The Dissonance.

It has been customary to date the commencement of the destructive criticism of the Fourth Gospel from the appearance of a small work on *The Dissonance of the Evangelists*, by Edward Evanson, which was published in 1792.[4] The work consists of two hundred and eighty-nine small octavo pages, of which thirty-three are devoted to S. John, and deal with the usually alleged discrepancies between this Gospel and one or more of the other three, especially that according to S. Luke. The author's previous career was scarcely such as to qualify him for the task which he undertook, though he himself thought that it was. He had for reasons not connected with the present question, resigned his position as a clergyman in 1778, and

The author.

> trusts his mind has been perfectly unbiassed and impartial in its investigations ;

because he had been

> unconnected for above fifteen years with any religious sect or party whatsoever, disdaining the office of a teacher of so plain a thing as Christianity, considered as a lucrative occupation, and too far advanced in life to have any temporal interest in view.[5]

The work,

He admits the authenticity of S. Luke and of the Acts of the Apostles in terms which must sound strange to some of his successors :—

> We have here, then, every kind of evidence, whereof the nature of the case admits, to convince us of the genuine

---

[4] *The Dissonance of the Four generally received Evangelists, and the Evidence of their respective Authenticity examined.* By Edward Evanson, A.M., Ipswich. MDCCXCII.

[5] *Ibid.* Preface, p. ix.

authenticity and veracity of both these histories; and with these, for my own part, I am abundantly satisfied.[6]

On the other hand, he had long been induced

to reject three of the four generally received Gospels, as spurious fictions of the second century, unnecessary and even prejudicial to the cause of true christianity, and in every respect unworthy of the regard which so many ages have paid to them.[7]

This preference for S. Luke is the more remarkable, as in the author's opinion

Prophecy is by far the most satisfactory and the only lasting, supernatural evidence of the truth of any Revelation.[8]

Of the author's critical discrimination you will form a sufficient opinion from the following sentence:—

I think it my duty to add briefly my reasons for expunging also out of the volume of duly authenticated scriptures of the *New Covenant*, the Epistles, to the Romans—to the Ephesians—to the Colossians—to the Hebrews—of James—of Peter—of John—of Jude,—and, in the book of the Revelation, the Epistles to the seven churches of Asia.[9]

Of the cogency of the reasons for rejecting the Epistle to the Romans, which, as far as I know, no modern critic in England or Germany rejects, and as a final example of the author's critical powers, let us take the following comment on the salutation to 'Rufus chosen in the Lord, and his mother and mine':—[1]

---

[6] *Dissonance, ut supra*, p. 111.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 255.

[8] *Ibid.* p. 6.

[9] *Ibid.* p. 256.

[1] Rom. xvi. 13.

And if there is any reason to believe that St. Paul's mother was then living, is it credible, that an old woman of Tarsus in Cilicia, whose son was so wonderfully appointed to preach the Gospel, and who was occupied in that commission in Asia and Greece, should leave her native country and such a son, and ramble after other preachers of the Gospel, at so advanced an age, to the far distant metropolis of Italy?[2]

unworthy of the subject.

The whole work is indeed quite unworthy of its subject, and would be unworthy of your attention were it not for the conspicuous position which has been assigned to it. There is some difficulty in avoiding the suspicion that it has been referred to and quoted much more frequently than it has been seen or read. It is now rare, and, except as a name with which to head a list, has passed into merited oblivion; but it caused no small stir when it was published.

The replies.

Several answers at once appeared, among them one by Dr. Joseph Priestley,[3] the well-known Unitarian minister, and one by Mr. David Simpson.[4] A

---

[2] *Dissonance*, *ut supra*, p. 260.

[3] *Letters to a Young Man*, part ii., 1793.

[4] *An Essay on the Authenticity of the New Testament* (1793). As an example of the state of biblical knowledge in the last century, which is important to us as accounting for the spread of the opinions of the English Deists and others, it may be noted that when Mr. Simpson, who had completed his course at one of the best classical schools in the country, and at St. John's College, Cambridge, and taken his degree, became a candidate for the ministry, he did not possess a Bible, and that when he bought one he hid it from his friends lest he should 'incur the imputation of Methodism.' *Memoir of the Author* by Edward Parsons, pp. vi, vii, in Simpson's *Plea for the Deity of Jesus*, 1812.

The above is an example from Yorkshire. It may be interesting to supplement it by one from Somerset which is furnished by second and posthumous edition of Evanson's work appeared in 1805, and certain principles in it were discussed in the *Bampton Lectures* of 1810, and the Lecturer gives in his preface some facts about the book for an 'obscure student of the history of religious controversies.'[5]

German influences.

The battle was soon shifted from English to German ground. The opening years of the nineteenth century were in Germany fruitful alike in literature, criticism, patriotism, philosophy, religion. Fichte at Jena, and later at Berlin, Jacobi at Munich, were in the fulness of their power, and Schelling was foreshadowing his still greater influence. The Romanticists, Herder, Novalis (Hardenberg), La Motte Fouqué, Schlegel, were modifying the currents of cultured thought.[6] The University of Berlin was founded in 1810, when Halle had become subject to France, and

---

the following letter from Miss H. More to Mr. Wilberforce, in which she describes her work in Cheddar: 'We found more than two thousand people in the parish, almost all very poor. . . . We went to every house in the place, and found each a scene of the greatest ignorance and vice. We saw but one Bible in all the parish, and that was used to prop a flower-pot.' Roberts, *Memoirs of the Life and Correspondence of Mrs. Hannah More*, ed. 3, 1835, vol. ii. pp. 295–96.

[5] *Certain Principles in Evanson's 'Dissonance of the Evangelists, &c.,' examined in Eight Discourses preached in* 1810. Thomas Falconer, *Bampton Lectures.* Oxford, 1811. Appendix, 1822. Preface, p. v.

[6] See the interesting chapters on the influence of these writers in Hagenbach's *History of the Church in the 18th and 19th Centuries.* Eng. Trans. by Dr. Hurst, New York, 1869, vol. ii. Cf. Schwarz, *Zur Geschichte der neuesten Theologie*, pp. 3 sqq.; Gervinus, *Nationalliteratur*, vol. v. p. 600; and esp. Baur, *Geschichte der christlichen Kirche*, Bd. iv. 2te Aufl. pp. 55–60.

numbered among its first teachers Schleiermacher, Neander, and De Wette. Three years later the students were singing in every street Körner's songs, which both expressed and roused a patriotism that defied Napoleon's invading power, and became the spirit of the united fatherland. The peace brought by its side the tercentenary of Luther and the Reformation, and while some men hoped and some men feared that a new reformation lay before them in the not-distant future, the nation, fresh from the throes of its mighty struggle, was baptized anew into the spiritual realities of the great Reformation of the past.

Bearing of these years on the Gospels.'

These years were naturally not without their direct bearing on the question of the Gospels. The literary catalogues of the period contain references to a large number of books and articles upon our own part of the subject, among which Herder's *Son of God, Saviour of the World*,[7] the *Commentary* of Paulus,[8] the *Introductions* of Hug,[9] and Eichhorn,[1] and Schmidt,[2] the discussion of Justin's quotations by Winer,[3] are the most important. The leading idea of writers who admitted the dissonance of the Evangelists was that the Fourth Gospel was to be maintained, even if this involved the sacrifice of the others. But if we pass over the period without a more detailed notice, we shall find justification for doing so in the general acceptance of the opinion which Strauss and others express, that Bretschneider is the first writer who deals with the Johannine question in a way which is worthy of modern scientific requirements;[4] and that it is from his date that the inquiry becomes one of first importance.

---

[7] Herder, J. G., *Von Gottes Sohn der Welt Heiland*, 1797.

[8] Paulus, H. E. G., *Commentar über das Neue Testament*, iv. Theil, 1te Abth., 1te Hälfte, 1812.

[9] Hug, J. L., *Einleitung in die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, ed. 1, 1808.

[1] Eichhorn, J. G., *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 1810.

[2] Schmidt, J. E. C., *Historisch-kritische Einleitung ins Neue Testament*, 1804.

[3] Winer, G. B., *Justinum Martyrem evangeliis canonicis usum fuisse ostenditur*, 1819.

Bretschneider, 1776–1848.

Life and earlier works.

Karl Gottlieb Bretschneider was the son of a country pastor in Saxony. He was educated at Leipzig, and having scruples about entering the ministry, for which he had been intended, he devoted himself for some years to literary and tutorial work. He was afterwards ordained, and in 1816 became general superintendent at Gotha. He filled this office, and was practically head of the church in the dukedom, until his death in 1848. His principal earlier works are two dogmatic treatises, which derive special value from the author's historical investigations; and from the calm, sober-minded independence, that refused to sacrifice theology to rationalism on the one hand, or to mysticism on the other. He afterwards more openly opposed the newer teaching of Schleiermacher, Marheineke, and Hase. In earlier life he had also written upon the LXX. and Apocrypha, and his scholarship was further attested by the more mature, and perhaps best known of his books, the *Lexicon to the New Testament*.[5]

---

[4] Cf. Strauss, *Das Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk bearbeitet*, 1864, pp. 90 sq.

[5] *Lexicon manuale Græco-latinum in libros N. T.*, 1829.

The *Probabilia*:

In 1820 Bretschneider published at Leipzig his work on the *Probabilities concerning the Nature and Origin of the Gospel and Epistles of the Apostle John.*[6] It was originally written in German, and this accounts for the form of some of the sentences; but it was published in Latin, for it was not intended for general reading, and the conclusions which the writer suggests tentatively, and submits to the opinions of experts, are put forward only as *Probabilities.* He expresses this in the following terms:—

its purpose,

> But we ask you, kind reader, to believe that whatever conclusions we have come to, we do not regard them as the utterances of an oracle, but as things which seem probable after discussion. It is not that in our opinion the Gospel of John *is* spurious, but only that it *seems* to be so, though we should have preferred to write *is* more frequently instead of, for the thousandth time, repeating *seems.* For we expect, nay, we hope, that the result will be that experts in criticism will teach us better wherever we may have made mistakes, and we will accept their corrections most willingly. For we adopt the words of Cicero[7] as our own:—
>
> 'I will explain these things as far as I can, but you must not regard what I say as certain and fixed, as if it were said by the Pythian Apollo; but as said by one frail mortal among many following out probabilities by the help of conjecture. For my part, I cannot go further than to trace resemblances to truth. Let those talk about certainties who say, on the one hand, that they can be perceived, and profess on the other that they themselves are wise.'[8]

and scope.

The author excuses himself from writing a history of the contemporary discussion of the question

---

[6] *Probabilia de Evangelii et Epistolarum Joannis, Apostoli, indole et origine*, 1820.

[7] Tusc. Quæst. i. 8.

[8] *Probabilia, ut supra*, Preface, p. viii.

—though he had read most of the writings on either side, and gives a list of them here and in the second edition of his *Systematic Exposition of Dogmatic Conceptions*,[9] which had been published a year before—on the ground that he wishes to keep his book within due limits, that it was necessary to deal with the more important issues only, and that the establishment of truth would be in itself the refutation of error.[1] The book is accordingly a small one, containing only 224 octavo pages, but it consists of a series of important propositions, and there are few arguments of any value in the voluminous literature of the later discussions, the germ of which may not be found here.

The Johannine discourses,

The first question which he examines is,

> Whether the Fourth Gospel is worthy of credit in its reports of the discourses of Jesus, and whether it is more worthy of credit than the earlier Gospels.[2]

largely imaginary.

And the conclusion to which he comes is—

> We seem not to be far from the truth when we determine that the discussions between Jesus, the disciples, the Jews and the Baptist are not real, but are, at all events, to a very great extent imaginary, and that the author of the Gospel was not a companion of Jesus, nor a hearer of his teaching; and this opinion is strongly confirmed by the fact that circumstances can be shown to have existed in the state of Christianity in the second century which account for the writer's presentation of these discussions between Jesus and

---

[9] *Systematische Entwickelung aller in der Dogmatik vorkommenden Begriffe*, 2 ed., 1819.

[1] *Probabilia*, *ut supra*, Preface, p. vii.

[2] *Ibid.* cap. i. *ad init.* p. 1.

his adversaries. This is discussed more fully in a subsequent chapter.[3]

The author not the Apostle,

He next proceeds to give reasons for the proposition—

that it was neither the Apostle John nor any other companion of Jesus who had himself seen and heard all things who composed the Gospel, but a man who lived later, and used traditions written or unwritten.[4]

The third point to be established is—

nor a Palestinian,

that it is probable that the author of the Gospel was neither a Palestinian nor a Jew;[5]

nor a Jew.

and this is shown by the dogmatic expressions;[6] by forms of speech which a born Jew would not have used;[7] by the way in which the writer makes himself prominent in the Gospel, and his anxiety to establish his own trustworthiness;[8] by the illustrations of Jewish matters in which the author has made serious mistakes all through;[9] and, lastly, by the author's special error about the Paschal supper.[1]

Gospel sprung from

When Bretschneider comes to the task of construction, from which he does not shrink, he finds a point of departure in the statement of Justin that the Jews sent chosen men from Jerusalem through the whole world to denounce the godless heresy of the Christians,[2] and that there sprung up in the beginning and middle of the second century an apologetic zeal among Christians which could have had no place until it was excited. The Fourth Gospel, with its obviously apologetic and polemic purpose, is the result. This accounts for the form of dialogue, for the dogmatic argument, for the anti-Jewish rigour, for the choice of material, for the omissions. This explains the frequent opposition of Jesus to 'the Jews' as distinguished from 'the people' or 'the multitude'; the discussions; the want of sense on the part of the Jews, who constantly pervert the meaning of Jesus, for the second-century writer is depicting the Jews of his own day; the disputes about dogmas, which were not matters of controversy between Jesus and the Pharisees of his time, but were discussed between Christians and Jews in the second century.[3]

---

[3] *Probabilia, ut supra*, cap. iii. *ad fin*. p. 64.

[4] *Ibid*. cap. ii. *ad init*. p. 65, *ad fin*. p. 82.

[5] *Ibid*. cap. iii. *ad init*. p. 83.

[6] *Ibid*. pp. 83–90.

[7] *Ibid*. pp. 91–92.

[8] *Ibid*. pp. 110–113.

[9] *Ibid*. pp. 92–100.

[1] *Ibid*. pp. 100–110.

[2] *Dial. c. Tryph*. pp. 234 and 335. *Ibid*. p. 115.

Jewish anti-Christian zeal,

It explains also, as he thinks, the choice of miracles, and specially the absence of all cases of possession;[4] the absence of precepts and parables, and the presence of discourses and a hidden gnosis;[5] the presentation of a life of Jesus which is the reflection of the Logos.[6] And this, lastly, sheds light on individual passages of the Gospel.[7]

The author then proceeds to ask whether the authority of the Gospel can be established from the Apocalypse, and finds, after a criticism of the views of

cannot be supported from

---

[3] *Probabilia, ut supra*, pp. 116–119.
[4] *Ibid.* pp. 119–123.
[5] *Ibid.* pp. 123–125.
[6] *Ibid.* pp. 125–129.
[7] *Ibid.* pp. 129–149.

the Apocalypse,

Eichhorn and Bertholdt, that even if it could be proved that the Apocalypse was by the Apostle John, which he regards as very doubtful, that would not strengthen the argument for the authorship of the Gospel—nay, it would, by reason of the manifest difference of the books, weaken it.[8]

nor from Epistles.

Can it be established from the Epistles? The argument based upon grammar and diction which Bertholdt adopts from Schulze is valid; if the Epistles were written by the Apostle John, it follows that the Gospel proceeded from the same author. But the argument can be inverted with equal validity; if the Gospel was not written by the Apostle John, it follows that the Epistles cannot be ascribed to him. Further, the Epistles, as the shorter and less developed writings, and as writings in which the author is less prominent, must depend upon the Gospel, not the Gospel upon the Epistles. They nowhere claim to be by S. John, and contain things which rather suggest that they are not; nor is there sufficient external testimony to establish the Epistles themselves, much less to establish the Gospel by their means.[9]

The Epistles themselves not proved to be Johannine,

Bertholdt's arguments are, in his opinion, conclusive as against Lange and Cludius, who had lately questioned the authorship of the First Epistle, but they will not bear all that the writer seeks to prove by them. Identity of authorship is not necessarily Johannine authorship. There is no proof that the Epistle belonged to the first century, or that the Apostles were ever known as presbyters, or that the Apostle John was on account of extreme old age called 'presbyter' in a special sense. When the testimony of Papias, and Polycarp, and Irenæus is examined, it is not found to be sufficient. There is really nothing in the Epistles which proves that they were by the Apostle John, and there is nothing to prevent our gathering from the Gospel that the Epistles also are not genuine. On the other hand, the Epistles tend to strengthen the opinion that the Gospel could not have been written by S. John.[1]

---

[8] *Probabilia, ut supra*, pp. 150–161.

[9] *Ibid.* pp. 161–164.

and strengthen adverse views about Gospel.

Bretschneider then proceeds to deal with the external evidences. The most ancient witnesses who are thought to have affirmed the authenticity of the Gospel—let them be heard, and their authority tested. The nature of the testimony is to be considered. There is no perfect—that is, clear and express—testimony to the Johannine authorship in the second century until its close, when we have it in Theophilus of Antioch, certain Valentinians, and Irenæus.[2] The testimony of the church at Ephesus;[3] of Barnabas, of Polycarp, of Ignatius, of the First Epistle of Clement of Rome; of the doubtful Recognitions; of the Homilies;[4] of the Sibylline Oracles;[5] of Justin Martyr and Tatian;[6] of Celsus,[7] of Hermas, of the Book of Henoch, of the testimony of the Twelve Patriarchs, of the Acts of Pilate, of the

The external evidences not sufficient.

---

[1] *Probabilia, ut supra,* pp. 165–177.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 178–181.

[3] *Ibid.* pp. 182–183.

[4] *Ibid.* pp. 184–188.

[5] *Ibid.* pp. 189–190.

[6] *Ibid.* pp. 191–194.

[7] *Ibid.* pp. 195–199.

Gospel of Nicodemus, of the Gospel to the Hebrews;[8] of the Montanists;[9] of Valentinus and the Valentinians; of Heracleon;[1] of Irenæus;[2] of Theophilus of Antioch;[3] are tested: and the conclusion is deduced that the external evidences are not sufficient in weight or antiquity or number to prove the authenticity of the Gospel; much less, therefore, do they prevent our concluding that the Gospel was not written by John —a conclusion which so many and so great internal arguments commend. Nor would the conclusion be different if we had external evidences, more and weightier than we have; for while internal evidence is of first importance in all works of very great antiquity, it is specially so in Christian writings, on account of the many fictitious books which were accepted by the credulous negligence of the first ages.[4]

Weight of opposing internal evidence.

Place probably Egypt.

As regards the place from which the Fourth Gospel sprung, it seems to have been first used by the Valentinians in Egypt, and to have been taken by them to Rome and thence to Gaul; and if we suppose that at the time the Gospel was taken to Rome it came also from the Alexandrians through Theophilus to Antioch, and was published in Asia Minor, there is no further difficulty from the external evidence. The place and person may both be doubtful, but this seems certain: that the author was not the Apostle John, nor a companion of Jesus, nor a Christian

Summary.

---

[8] *Probabilia, ut supra*, pp. 200–204.
[9] *Ibid.* pp. 205–211.
[1] *Ibid.* pp. 212–213.
[2] *Ibid.* pp. 214–217.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 218.
[4] *Ibid.* pp. 219–220.

sprung from or living in Palestine, nor a Jew by birth; but that he was some Christian of Alexandrian training, and filling the office of a presbyter, and that he made use of tradition and some written document. It is most likely that he lived in Egypt, partly from the line which he took on the Paschal question, partly because his doctrine agreed very largely with Gnosticism; and it is probable that the Gnostics first knew his Gospel in Egypt, strongly approved of it, took it to Rome, and gained general acceptance for it by the authority of the Roman church.[5]

Importance of the book.

It is threescore years and ten since these views were modestly submitted to the judgments of the learned—*Eruditorum judiciis modeste subjecit* is part of the title—and the case for the negative criticism has never been put with more cogency. Subsequent writers have been less modest, but also less learned. They have alleged some new facts and many new fancies. They have filled our book-cases with erudition, in the midst of which Bretschneider's little volume has taken a back shelf and has been hidden from view; but they have derived from it more than they have always known, and the advocate who today wants a brief from which to plead against the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel will find his case stated nowhere so well as here.

The learned theologians of the time did not receive Bretschneider's work in the spirit in which he submitted it to them. Reviews, pamphlets, books assailed him on all sides. He himself tells us that many of them were extremely passionate and bitter, and that the Minister von Einsiedel publicly denounced him as 'the John-slanderer.'[6] But, with a patience which has not always been manifested in this controversy, he none the less studied the replies; and at the end of two years, when the second edition of his *Handbook of Dogmatics*[7] was published, he was convinced that his arguments had been fully answered, and frankly withdrew his conclusions. After two years' further thought he took occasion to repeat this retractation in a review article.[8] Four years later a third edition of the *Handbook of Dogmatics* was published, and the author reprinted part of the preface of the second edition which contained the statement of his change of view, and also called attention to the fact in a note in the body of the work. His book, as he tells us in emphatic language, which he took every opportunity to repeat, had accomplished its purpose. The *Probabilities* had brought out proofs of the authenticity. The question is settled for the theological public.[9]

---

[5] *Probabilia, ut supra*, pp. 221-224.

Bretschneider convinced by replies.

Definite and repeated retractation.

'Question is settled.'

---

[6] *Autobiography*, translated by Professor G. E. Day in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, April 1853, p. 259.

[7] *Handbuch der Dogmatik*, 1822.

[8] Tzschirner's *Magazin für christliche Prediger*, 1824, pp. 153–167.

[9] 'Bei der biblischen Kritik habe ich auch die Johanneischen Schriften ganz unbedenklich als ächte Quellen gebraucht, weil die Zweifel an der Aechtheit dieser Schriften, die ich vor einiger Zeit dem gelehrten Publikum vorlegte, von mir selbst nur als Anfragen angesehen worden sind, welche die Veranlassung geben möchten, dass der Beweis der Aechtheit dieser Schriften, der mir noch unvollkommen schien, gründlicher geführt werde, und

I do not claim Bretschneider as in himself a strong witness in favour of the Johannine authorship, though there might be good ground for doing so; but he at least furnishes conclusive evidence that at the close of the first generation of this century, destructive criticism had directed its strongest forces against the citadel only to be driven back in the attempt. Strauss tries to minimize the force of Bretschneider's withdrawal, though he was ready to welcome the danger and violence of the attack, by the statement that his general theological position was not deep enough to bear all that followed from a rejection of the Fourth Gospel; and marvels at the prejudice of a man like Schleiermacher, who says that he was not moved for a moment by the doubts which had been put forward, though it was just as well that they had been discussed.[1]

Bretschneider's

But Bretschneider's true position is revealed in the singularly candid posthumous autobiography which

---

weil ich nach den darüber erschienenen Beurtheilungen und angekündigten Schriften wohl hoffen darf, diese Absicht völlig erreicht zu sehen.'—Preface of 1822. 'Ich sehe jetzt diese Sache für das theologische Publikum als erledigt an.'—Note to reprint of foregoing in ed. 3, 1828, p. viii.

'Der Zweck, den meine "Probabilia de Evangelii et epistolar. Joannis apostoli indole et origine" (*Lips.* 1820. 8.) hatten, nämlich die Untersuchung über die Aechtheit der Johanneischen Schriften neu anzuregen, und weiter zu führen, ist erreicht worden, und die aufgestellten Zweifel können nun wohl als erledigt angesehen werden.'—*Ibid.* p. 268. Repeated and enlarged ten years later, ed. 4, 1838, vol. i. p. 343. Cf. esp. the explanation of the Johannine Discourses, *Ibid.* pp. 362 sq.

[1] Strauss, *Das Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk bearbeitet*, 1864. Schleiermacher, *Einleitung*, ii. § 15, pp. 90 sqq. Cf. *infra*, pp. 212 sq.

character in *Autobiography.* has been published by his son.[2] He was before all things a man of calm severe reason. He would accept no statement which could not be expressed and proved as a logical proposition. Nothing was so distasteful to him as obscure and unintelligible mystic talk. He grew into an attitude of strong and even bitter opposition to Schleiermacher and his followers, whom he regarded as largely under the influence of Schelling, and the attacks in the *Evangelical Church Journal*[3] and elsewhere, drove him further and further from the orthodoxy of his earlier days. In 1832 he succeeded Zimmermann as editor of the *General Church Journal*,[4] and used it as a means to oppose the reaction against rationalism.[5] So far from recalling the statements of the *Probabilia* on account of their consequences, it is more likely, if we are to trace the subtle currents of bias, that he was induced to write them on account of the prominence given to the Fourth Gospel by Schleiermacher, and that he withdrew them because he saw no possible ground left on which they could be honestly maintained. But in his later years he was a controversialist rather than a critic, and regarded the episode of the *Probabilia* as one that he did not care to recall.

---

[2] *Bibliotheca Sacra, ut supra*, Oct. 1852 and April 1853.

[3] *Evangelische Kirchen-Zeitung*, Berlin.

[4] *Allgemeine Kirchen-Zeitung*, Darmstadt.

[5] 'The active antagonism into which he was now thrown with the revived orthodoxy, had the natural effect of rendering his tendency towards rationalism more decided. He had begun with being a rationalistic supranaturalist; he ended with being at most a supranaturalistic rationalist.' *Bibliotheca*, Oct. 1852, p. 659.

Strauss, 1808–1874.

No name has been better known to the readers and thinkers of our own generation than that of Strauss, and although his work does not add much to the criticism of the Fourth Gospel, I should expose myself to fair censure for passing over one who is generally thought to be a strong adverse witness, if he were not included in our brief review.

Home life.

David Friedrich Strauss, whose sixty-six years of life extended from 1808 to 1874, was born at Ludwigsburg in Swabia. His father, who had been engaged in trade, lost a large part of his means, and a temperament naturally morose became embittered, though he professedly followed the strictest lines of orthodox religion. He seems at no time to have had much sympathy with, or influence over, his son, and what he had did not extend to the son's later manhood. The mother is said to have cared less for the outward forms of religion, but to have been a woman of healthy judgment and natural kindness which was often tested, and of warm affection for her son.

Blaubeuren.

At the age of thirteen the lad left the little day-school at Ludwigsburg for the seminary at Blaubeuren, which was then an evangelical college, but was called a 'monastery' from its earlier history. How big with issues for the after days of his own life, for the life of many another, was the day on which this step was taken! Here he met Christian Märklin, his fellow in work and play, his fellow in the doubts and struggles of his later life. He has himself given a sketch of Märklin, light indeed, but, like all he touched, showing the master's hand, and important to us, for in telling the friend's life and thoughts he has told his own.[6] At Blaubeuren he found Kern the philologist, to whom he owed so much, and above all he found Baur, who, like himself, had gone there as a boy to school, and now, after a distinguished career at Tübingen, had come back to teach. Five years later, the boys themselves went to the evangelical college or *Stift* in the same university. Kern and Baur soon followed as teachers. Ferdinand Christian Baur was in 1826 appointed Professor of Historical Theology in the old evangelical University of Tübingen; and David Friedrich Strauss, a small-featured, delicate, overgrown youth of eighteen, was in his class-room. These days of Blaubeuren and Tübingen are full of interest, but this is not the place or time for treating of them. The visits to his friend and townsman Kerner, that supra-supranaturalist at Weinsberg; the period in which Strauss was led captive by clairvoyance, or perhaps by the fair 'clairvoyante of Prevorst,' her prophecy that he would always remain a believer; the steps by which he was led from this yeast stage through Jacob Boehme to Schelling, Schleiermacher, Hegel; his brilliant examination and his popularity as an evangelical preacher in a country village; his views of an esoteric creed for the library and an exoteric doctrine for the pulpit; his appointment and short stay as a teacher at Maulbronn; the resignation and visit to Berlin

Tübingen.

---

[6] *Christian Märklin, ein Lebens- und Charakterbild*, 1851.

with the special desire to hear Hegel lecture; the preliminary visit to Schleiermacher, who told him of Hegel's sudden death; his host's displeased surprise when he thoughtlessly answered that the chief purpose of his visit to Berlin was thereby foiled; the way in which he was impressed by Schleiermacher's lectures; his return to Swabia; his appointment in 1832 as *Repetent* at Tübingen, in the beloved school of the older evangelical pietism, of Flatt and Storr and Bengel, and now presided over by Steudel, the most famous theologian and preacher of Würtemberg, great-grandson of Bengel, and his spiritual as well as lineal descendant; the influence produced by the young tutor's lectures; his retirement to give himself to literary work;—these things are told, and many more than these, by Strauss himself, by Baur, by Schwarz, in articles and memoirs, by friends and by foes, and with special interest in the charming sketch, which, with the loving hand of lifelong friendship, Dr. Eduard Zeller devoted to his memory.[7]

Berlin.

Tutor at Tübingen.

Three years had almost run their course since the appointment to Tübingen. They were years of quiet calm for the Church. Since Hegel's death in 1831, the influence of Schleiermacher and Schelling had become supreme. Philosophy and theology were one. Criticism was hushed into silence. Men of the severer orthodoxy, like Hengstenberg, who was now teaching at Berlin and editing the *Evangelical Church Journal*, or of the carefully balancing, born critical

Influence of Schleiermacher.

---

[7] *David Friedrich Strauss in his Life and Writings,* 1874, Eng. Trans. 1879.

turn of mind of De Wette, or of the developing broader views of Bretschneider, who was opposing both Hengstenberg and Schleiermacher in the *General Church Journal*,[8] did not much like the peace. But when Schleiermacher died in 1834, he left a position and an influence in theology and philosophy and their harmonious interdependence, which was without an example. The sky was clear as that of a summer's day, and no cloud was to be seen on the horizon, when suddenly, as by the crash of thunder, Germany, and then France, England, America, the theological world, was aroused to know that a terrific storm was at hand.

The calm of 1834.

The storm of 1835 caused by the *Leben Jesu.*

It took its rise in the University of Tübingen from which Strauss issued the first volume of his *Life of Jesus* in 1835.[9] It was a bitter fate for Steudel, who mourns for the young man who sent forth the electric spark as it were from his own study.[1] Had he not himself settled all theological difficulties by protesting against them in his work on the *Dogmatics of the Evangelical Protestant Church*, which had been only just published?[2]

The replies.

But the spark would not have become the lightning flash nor have heralded the storm if the atmosphere had not been charged with electricity, and if Steudel and a host of others who attempted to reply to Strauss, had not lent themselves as conductors for the fluid. Every village pulpit had its own antidote to the poison; every candidate for a theological degree had as a thesis his own unanswerable answer; every church journal had its own editorial settlement of the question. And in this way the book was advertised throughout the world, and hundreds read it who would otherwise have never heard of it. And when they read it, they found it interesting, while the replies were dull; for it was written in good German, and the answers in bad. Strauss was, like Renan, a born artist in words, and most people are more attracted by the pictures, the ornaments, the carvings and gildings of a house than they are by the foundations. But the foundations are more important if we are going to live in the house, and if it is to be to us a home to shield us by night as by day, in winter as in summer, in all the storms of life and death, in time, in eternity.

---

[8] *Allgemeine Kirchen-Zeitung*, *ut supra*.

[9] *Das Leben Jesu kritisch bearbeitet*, 1835–6.

[1] 'Aus seinem Cabinet heraus.' Cf. Baur, *Geschichte der christlichen Kirche*, vol. v., 1862, p. 364.

[2] *Glaubenslehre der evangelisch-protestantischen Kirche*, 1834.

'Nothing new' in the *Leben Jesu.*

It has often been said that there was nothing new in Strauss's *Life of Jesus*. The critical methods which Heyne had introduced, and Wolf had applied to Homer, and Niebuhr to early Roman history, had already been applied by Vater, De Wette, and others to the books of the Old Testament, and even in the New Testament the way was not wholly unprepared. The discussions of the origin and relation of the Gospels had led also to a growing conviction that the explanation was to be found in the existence of an oral Gospel. Here there were grounds for the superstructure of the theory of

Critical methods.

The mythical theory.

myth, and once started it was carried with mechanical rigidity through every detail of the life of Jesus. Strauss honestly believed himself to be absolutely free from prejudice, but he was bound hand and foot by the dogmas of the Hegelian *Left.* The individual is nothing, and therefore historical records which treat of the individual are of no authority. The Infinite cannot manifest itself in the finite, and therefore the incarnation as told in the Gospels is impossible. Humanity is the true incarnation of God, the child of a known mother—Nature; of an unknown father—Spirit. The immanence of God is absolute, and miracle is therefore impossible. The legends of the Old Testament which grew round the Messianic idea were mythically applied to the person of the historic Jesus. The Church portrayed, not the Jesus whom Apostles saw, but the Christ which myth unconsciously created.

I must not, however, be tempted to wander so far from my immediate subject as to state, and far less to criticise, the philosophical theology of Strauss.

Later investigations of myths.

Later investigations have taught us that upon any theory of myths they belong to the infancy of the nation and not to its manhood.[3] The vigorous common sense of Baron de Bunsen at once cried out:—

Position of Bunsen,

> But the idea of men writing mythic histories between the time of Livy and Tacitus, and of St. Paul mistaking such for realities![4]

---

[3] Cf. the able articles *Myth*, *Mythical Theory*, *Mythology*, in McClintock and Strong's *Cyclopædia.* New York, 1880.

[4] *Letter to Dr. Arnold*, Oct. 1836. *Life of Arnold*, by Dean Stanley, ed. 12, vol. ii. p. 52, note.

Ullmann held Strauss in a grip from which there was no release when he asked *History or Myth?*[5] If the Church unconsciously developed the Christ, then who or what developed the Church? And in the greater mind of Strauss's master there was already growing a theory of tendency, which, whatever else it was to do, was certainly to deal a deathblow to the theory of myth.

Ullmann,

Baur.

Strauss's critique of the *Life of Jesus* contained no critique of the Gospels which were the source of that life. He admitted that this was a weak point when Baur called attention to it.[6] His whole theory is however based upon an assumption of the spuriousness of all the Canonical Gospels, and especially of that of the Fourth Gospel. If this be really a Gospel according to S. John, the mythical theory of Strauss is at an end; and yet so uncertain is he of his ground, that in the preface to the third edition, which was published in 1838–9, he is not quite sure that the Gospel was after all not the work of S. John. It is not that he is drawn over to the conviction that it is Apostolic; but that the work of Neander and the growing conviction of De Wette have told upon him, and he is no longer sure that it is not. But in the fourth edition, which followed in 1840, he is again quite sure. And this on no secondary question, but on one which was at the very foundation of his whole theory. This uncertainty is so incredible that I

The *Leben Jesu* contained no critique of the Gospels.

Incredible uncertainty

---

[5] *Historisch oder Mythisch?* Hamburg, 1838.

[6] Cf. Lecture V. p. 231.

about John,

prefer to put it before you in the words of Baur, his tutor and friend :—

described by Baur.

> Nothing is more indicative of the position of criticism at that time than the confession which Strauss makes in the preface to the third edition of his *Life of Jesus*. The alterations which occur in this new edition all depend more or less on the fact that a renewed study of the Fourth Gospel had made his earlier doubts of this gospel themselves in their turn doubtful. Not that he was convinced of its authenticity, but that he was no longer convinced of the contrary. In the peculiar position of the characteristics of this most remarkable gospel, trustworthy and incredible, likely and unlikely, crossing and colliding with each other, he brought forward in the first development of his work, with polemical zeal, just the adverse side which it seemed to him had been neglected. Since then the other side has gradually received its due from him, but he was not in a position to do as almost all other living theologians even to De Wette did—that is, sacrifice at once the opposite considerations. Is it possible for a man to be more wavering and uncertain on one of the chief problems of New Testament criticism? And yet even this utterance is made only that in the next edition of the *Life of Jesus* he might withdraw this doubting of his own doubt.[7]

Strauss's life between the third and fourth editions.

But a good deal had occurred between the issue of the third and fourth editions. His mother died in March 1839, and with her the chief joy and solace of his life had gone. The father, never in sympathy with him, had been embittered by the publication of his book, and the mother's last days had been saddened by storms which broke upon the peace of home. The brother lay weak and ill. His friends sought for him work and hope without, to draw him from these miseries within. He was nominated this same year to the chair of Christian Dogmatics and Ethics at Zürich. He did not think his views to be inconsistent with the duties which would devolve upon him, and gladly accepted it ; but feeling ran so high, that forty thousand signatures were attached to a public protest. *Strauss darf und soll nicht kommen!* became the cry of an excited populace. In vain did the would-be professor explain his views in a letter to the burgomaster and citizens. In vain did his friend Professor Orelli explain for him.[8] *Strauss darf und soll nicht kommen!* was the reply which the people were ready to maintain by force of arms. In vain did the ministry at length yield, cancel the appointment, and pension the professor. It was too late. Zürich would have none of Strauss, and Zürich rose in insurrection and deposed a government which had tried to force him upon them.

---

[7] Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, Preface to ed. 3, 1838–9; and Hase, *Geschichte Jesu*, 1876, p. 32. Cf. Lecture V. pp. 230 sq.

Nomination to Zürich.

It is never very profitable to speculate upon what might have been. What if that mother had not died, if that father had been full of sympathy and guiding love, if that brother had been strong and well ? What if the professor's chair had brought that disturbed mind into contact with the thoughts and needs of student life, and outside the contracted circles of itself and its one fixed idea ? We know not.

We know what was. There came in the following

Fourth edition

---

[8] *The Opinions of Professor David F. Strauss, etc.*, 1865. Eng. Trans. from 2nd ed., 1844, of original.

and the *Christliche Glaubenslehre.*

year the fourth and most extreme edition of the *Life*, written for the first time in the German character that it might be accessible to the people, and there came also a work on *Christian Dogmatics in their historical development and in their struggle with modern knowledge.*[9] This was the completion of Strauss's original plan, to write a work upon the idea—*Begriff*—as well as one upon the representation—*Vorstellung*—of theological truth, which he had done in the *Life of Jesus*. For our present purpose the work is important, as it foretold the appearance of a book which would be based upon sounder principles than Bretschneider's *Probabilia*, and would settle the question of the Gospels in the light of fresh knowledge of early Church history. The reference is said [1] to be to the singular work of Lützelberger,[2] who visited Strauss this year and published his book soon afterwards. It aimed at proving that John was never in Ephesus or Asia Minor, that he died before A.D. 55–57, and that the Gospel was written in the neighbourhood of Edessa, about A.D. 135–140. But this work seems of too little importance for the weighty words of Strauss's reference, and I cannot help thinking that the work of Baur was that of which he prophesied, not without some knowledge.[3]

---

[9] *Die christliche Glaubenslehre in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwickelung und im Kampfe mit der modernen Wissenschaft*, 1840. See esp. vol. i. pp. 194–196.

[1] Ebrard, *Wissenschaftliche Kritik*, 1842, pp. 1049 sq. note. *Darmstädter Kirchenzeitung*, Jan. 1841.

[2] *Die kirchliche Tradition über den Apostel Johannes und seine Schriften, in ihrer Grundlosigkeit nachgewiesen.* Leipzig, 1840.

[3] But see Bleek's criticism on Lützelberger in *Beiträge zur Evangelien-Kritik*, 1846, pp. 88 sqq., and 224 sq.

For more than twenty years Strauss produced no theological work. He has himself told, and therefore he wishes everybody to know something of what his life was during this period. Without the home which his mother's love had always blessed, refused the work for which he had always hoped, his friends had rejoiced to watch the influence which was exercised over him by Fräulein Agnes Schebest, a lady whose natural gifts and acquired power had won for her a prominent position on the operatic stage. They were betrothed in August 1842; five years later they dissolved, by mutual agreement, a union which neither could endure longer. He told the story of these years in one touching sentence from a short paper on *Memories of my good Mother*, which he wrote for his daughter on the day of her confirmation :—

No theological work in period 1840–1864.

Agnes Schebest.

> The mother left me behind in a wild storm which Fate had brought upon me, and the brother in a still more tottering state; but often have I since thought it a happy thing that she did not live to see the worse storm which a few years later dashed my life's barque upon the rocks.[4]

In the political troubles of 1848, Strauss was pressed by the extreme liberals of Ludwigsburg to become a candidate for the Frankfort parliament, and against his own judgment yielded to their wishes. He was not returned, but obtained a seat in the second chamber of Würtemberg. The fact is not without

Strauss in parliament.

---

[4] Kleine Schriften, Neue Folge, 1866, pp. 233–269 : *Zum Andenken an meine gute Mutter. Für meine lieben Kinder.* Geschrieben auf den Confirmationstag meiner Tochter, den 11. April, 1858.

importance to us as it throws further light upon the character of the man, that to the indignant surprise of his constituents he was found to be on the conservative side. He published his addresses to the electors in *Six Theological Political Popular Speeches*, and tells them in the preface how he had been convinced that

> direct elective proceedings hold good all the less, the more unlimited is the right of election. . . .

Again, he writes in a letter of May 30, 1849 :—

> . . . if I have only to choose between the despotism of the prince and the masses, I am unhesitatingly in favour of the former . . . the last drop of blood in me abhors the authority of demagogues as the extreme of all evils.[5]

Other literary work.

His critical powers found a congenial sphere during this period in a series of biographical and literary works which do not fall within our subject, but I shall venture to suggest to anyone who would know the chastened beauty of the mind and life of Strauss, and would know how deeply it was penetrated by the spirit of the life of Jesus, in the midst of much from which we shrink—the loving heart asserting what the analytical intellect denied—a half-hour's study of the address on renunciation, which he delivered in 1863 over his brother's open grave.[6]

The new *Leben Jesu*, 1864,

In 1864 Strauss came back again to his earlier work in a new *Life of Jesus composed for the German*

---

[5] Zeller, *Strauss*, *ut supra*, pp. 90, 93.

[6] Kleine Schriften, Neue Folge, 1866, pp. 341–351. *Worte des Andenkens an Friedrich Wilhelm Strauss*, Feb. 24, 1863.

People.[7] It was new, and not new, for it was largely an attempt to find a place for the later investigations of Baur and others, within the circle of the author's mythical theory ; and he follows Baur in placing the Fourth Gospel after the middle of the second century.

The preface prepares us for what we are to expect in the book. The first edition of the *Leben Jesu*, written twenty-nine years before, had been written for theologians, since the laity were not yet sufficiently prepared for it. But now the author writes for the laity and endeavours to make himself clear to every man of culture and thought. As for professional theologians, he does not care whether they read his book or not.[8]

written for the laity,

The interval has taught him on the one hand that these questions are not to be kept from the public, for they have been brought home to them by those who were his most determined foes ; and, on the other hand, theologians are of all people those who can least attain to an impartial judgment, for they are at the same time judge and party in the suit. To question the evangelic history is, they think, to endanger the clerical order, and self-preservation is the first law of life. If Christianity ceases to be a miracle, they cannot play their favourite *rôle* of miracle-workers ; they will have to keep to teaching and give up blessing, and the work is less easy and less productive. He must turn to the people because

'theologians' are the least impartial,

---

[7] *Das Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk bearbeitet*, 1864.

[8] *Ibid.* p. xi.

the theologians will not hear, as S. Paul turned to the Gentiles because the Jews rejected his Gospel. When once the best among the people shall have attained the height of rejecting what most of the clergy insist on offering them, these clergy will have to yield before the force of advanced public opinion. He addresses himself therefore to the people, and issues not so much a new edition, as a new work developing the old idea ; and he takes the opportunity of referring to more recent works, answering objections and correcting his results by later researches by himself and others. If ever a new edition of the original work is needed—he did not see that the day had long gone by for needing it—it is to be based upon the first edition with some slight modifications from the fourth, that is, his views are to be preserved in their extremest forms.

M. Renan,

He hails with joy M. Renan's work, which appeared just as his own was completed. Condemned as it was by a large number of bishops and by the Roman *Curia*, it must necessarily be a work of merit. It has its defects, but only one fundamental fault [that is, the acceptance of the Fourth Gospel].[9]

earlier *Lives of Jesus*,

Nor is the promise of this preface disappointed when we come to the critical introduction which follows in the body of the work. The author clears the ground by showing how all the preceding *Lives of Jesus*—the earlier ones of Hess and Herder, the detailed work of Paulus, the *Manual* of Hase, the posthumous *Lessons* of Schleiermacher—had all failed for different reasons, and pre-eminently because their writers did not see how certain it was that documents which told of the supernatural could not possibly be historical. And the subsequent works of Neander, Ebrard, Weisse, and Ewald were all in his opinion reactionary, and are criticised in terms which I refrain from quoting. Even Keim,[1] while flattering himself that he satisfies scientific requirements, is really steeped in theological illusion, but he is far in advance of the ordinary writers of *Lives of Jesus*, and even of M. Renan.[2]

---

[9] *Leben Jesu*, 1864, *ut supra*, p. xviii.

critique of the Gospels,

When Strauss comes to his criticism of the Gospels as the sources of the Life of Jesus, the absence of which, as we have seen, Baur had proved to be a serious defect in the earlier form of the work, he satisfies himself that there is no certain trace of the three first Gospels in their present form, until towards the middle of the second century,[3] that is, for fully a hundred years after the events are supposed to have taken place; and this interval everybody will admit to have been long enough for the growth of fictitious elements in all parts of the evangelic record. He supposes that no one will deny this, not even the theologian, if he has not wholly broken with criticism.

the 'theologian'

But the theologian, by way of compensation, as clings to the Fourth Gospel.

---

[1] The reference is not to Keim's larger *Jesu von Nazara*, which did not appear until 1867–72, but to his Inaugural Lecture at Zürich at the end of 1860, *Die menschliche Entwickelung Jesu Christi*, 1861.

[2] *Leben Jesu*, 1864, *ut supra*, p. 37. *Vie de Jésus*, 1863.

[3] *Ut supra*, p. 61.

Strauss thinks, clings more firmly to the Fourth Gospel as the work of an Apostle and an eyewitness, and the solid foundation of the history of primitive christianity.[4] This must surely be founded upon internal evidences, for of external testimony the Fourth Gospel is only more destitute than the other three. Papias tells us at least that Matthew composed a Hebrew Gospel, but of a Gospel of John we have no evidence that he says a word. It is true that we know Papias only through Eusebius, but as the historian set himself to collect the testimonies in favour of the books of the New Testament, and as he quotes Papias in favour of the First Epistle of John, the silence of Eusebius[5] about the Gospel is almost equivalent to that of Papias himself. And the silence of Papias is the more significant as he speaks expressly of his zeal in seeking for traditions of John; and further, as he was a bishop in Asia Minor and a friend of Polycarp, he had every facility for being exactly acquainted with the Apostle who passed his last years at Ephesus.

Weakness of the external evidence:

Papias,

The attempt to make Papias witness to the Fourth Gospel indirectly through the Epistle, must in Strauss's opinion fail, since Eusebius simply tells us that Papias derived certain quotations from this Epistle as he does from the first Epistle of Peter.[6] It is not necessary to understand him to mean that Papias definitely quoted as words of the Apostle John passages which we now find in the Epistle of John. Eusebius might have deduced from a certain resemblance of expressions or ideas the conclusion that Papias had known the Epistle, and have been deceived, just as theologians in our own days have deceived themselves in similar circumstances. And even if we press the most positive interpretation of Eusebius, and suppose that Papias had really quoted the First Epistle as a work from the hand of the Apostle, we should still have to prove that the Epistle and the Gospel come from the same author. It is granted that there are resemblances, but there are also very marked differences.

---

[4] *Leben Jesu*, 1864, *ut supra*, p. 62.

[5] Cf. Lecture VII. pp. 404 sqq.

[6] *Leben Jesu*, p. 63. Cf. *Hist. Eccles.* iii. 39. 17.

the Fourth Gospel itself,

But the conclusion of the Fourth Gospel itself is adduced as a witness. This is in the opinion of writers like Tholuck a certificate of authenticity sufficient to satisfy the most extreme scepticism ;[7] and yet Zeller is quite right in saying that this testimony proves nothing. It is either the assertion of the author himself which would not be testimony, or else it is the assertion of an interpolator which would be of no value. It is equally vain to attempt to support the authorship by such a reference as that in the second Epistle of Peter[8] to the putting off the tabernacle, which is supposed to be a reminiscence of our Lord's words in the last chapter of John, for there is no proof that this Epistle is much earlier than the close of the second century ; or by the resemblance between

Second Epistle of Peter,

---

[7] *Leben Jesu, ut supra*, p. 63. *Die Glaubenwürdigkeit der evangelischen Geschichte*, p. 276.

[8] 2 Peter i. 14 ; cf. John xxi. 18.

S. John and S. Mark, for it does not follow that S. John is the earlier.[9]

Ignatius,

Ignatius is supposed to furnish examples of reminiscences of the Fourth Gospel. Perhaps he does. But even if the phrases which are alleged [1] are more than specimens of the common religious language of the time, it is certain, Strauss thinks, that the Epistles of Ignatius cannot be placed before the middle of the second century; [2] and if the Fourth Gospel had been received as Apostolic from the end of the first century, it would have left deeper marks upon these and other writings of the period.

Justin Martyr,

The evidence of Justin Martyr is similarly disposed of. There are numerous and indisputable points of contact with the three first Gospels, but those with the Fourth Gospel are both rare and doubtful. But the doctrine of Justin is allied to that of the Fourth Gospel, and if he had known it to be an Apostolic work, he would have followed it more closely.[3] The only reference which is of importance is that in the first *Apology* to the new birth,[4] which Strauss explains in what was then the usual method of the negative school. He compares it with a passage in the Clementines,[5] and thinks that both Justin and the writer of the Fourth Gospel had borrowed from a common source in the supposed Gospel of the

---

[9] *Leben Jesu, ut supra*, pp. 64, 65.

[1] Cf. Lecture VII. pp. 395 sqq.

[2] Cf. *ibid.* pp. 400 sqq.

[3] Cf. Lecture II. p. 81.

[4] *Apology*, i. 61. Cf. John iii. 3-5.

[5] *Homil.* xi. 26.

Hebrews. The evidence of the *Philosophumena*,[6] the author of which he supposes to be a pseudo-Origen,[7] by no means proves that Basilides or Valentinus knew the Fourth Gospel, for it is not certain that the reference is in either case to the founder of the sect as distinguished from his followers. It is true that Tertullian tells us that Valentinus used a complete *Instrument*—that is, a *Testament*.[8] But then Tertullian's testimony, if it cannot be denied, can be discounted. He was not more capable of distinguishing between the founder of the sects and his followers than the pseudo-Origen was, and when he tells us in express terms that Valentinus possessed a complete New Testament, we should do well to inquire no further from him. It is similar to what he tells us of Marcion's[9] having rejected, and therefore having known, the Fourth Gospel.

the *Philosophumena.*

Then, as to the attempts, in the absence of external evidence, to prove on internal grounds—the names of the *æons*, for example—that Valentinus must have known the prologue and other portions of the Fourth Gospel. If this be so, why does Irenæus quote so many passages of the synoptics and of Paul, and not one from John when he is enumerating the places of the New Testament upon which the Valentinians founded their system of *æons*?[1] The quotations from

The internal evidence:

the Valentinians,

---

[6] Cf. Lecture VII. pp. 360 sqq.

[7] *Leben Jesu, ut supra*, pp. 67, 68. Cf. Lecture VII. pp. 361 sqq.

[8] *De Præscript. Hæret.* xxxviii. Cf. Lecture II. p. 92.

[9] *Adv. Marcion.* iv. 3, 5; *De Carne Christi*, 3. Cf. Lecture II. p. 94.

[1] *Adv. Hær.* i. 8. 1–4. Cf. Lecture II. p. 90.

John come only in an appendix on Ptolemæus, the disciple of Valentinus, and of him it is admitted from his *Letter to Flora* that he accepted the Gospel of John as an Apostolic work.[2] Nor is the commentary of Heracleon doubted. But this letter and commentary can hardly be placed earlier than the last thirty years of the second century.

the Montanists,

The same line of observation applies to the evidence of the Montanists, who are supposed to have derived their idea of the Paraclete from the Gospel of John; but if we inquire of Eusebius about their earliest connexion with the Church, we find nothing of either the term Paraclete or of the Fourth Gospel.[3] Like the Valentinians, they had originally no knowledge of the Gospel of John; but when it appeared later, both heresies hastened to lay hold of it.

the Clementines, the Apologists, Theophilus, Irenæus.

The references in the newly discovered portion of the Clementines[4] cannot, in Strauss's opinion, be denied,[5] nor the passage in the fragments of Apolinaris,[6] nor yet the references in the apologies of Tatian, and Athenagoras, nor in the works of Theophilus,[7] and Irenæus. But Theophilus is not to be accredited, because he does not give us his authority for attributing the Gospel to John; nor is Irenæus, because he does not tell us that he learned the authenticity of the Gospel from Polycarp, and because he does not always write with historical accuracy.

---

[2] *Leben Jesu, ut supra*, p. 68.

[3] *Hist. Eccles.* v. 16–19.

[4] Cf. Lecture VII. pp. 373 sqq.

[5] *Leben Jesu, ut supra*, p. 69. *Homil.* xix. 22. Cf. article by Volkmar, *Theol. Jahrb.* 1854, pp. 446 sq.; *Homil.* iii. 53; and Lecture II. p. 84.

[6] *Chron. Paschal. Al.* p. 14, ed. Dindorf.

[7] *Ad Autolycum*, ii. 22. Cf. Lecture I. pp. 29 sqq.

The Alcgi, their tactical mistake in rejecting the Apocalypse.

The Gospel, moreover, was not received without opposition towards the end of the second century, as is known from the Alogi.[8] Strauss would emphasize their position, and regrets that they did not themselves see how strong it really was. They were quite right to reject the Gospel, but it was dogmatic prejudice which led them to reject the Apocalypse. And this was a great tactical mistake. The relation of the two writings[9] is such that one can no more believe that the same person was author of both works than one can persuade Germans that Lessing composed the *Messiah*, or Klopstock composed *Nathan*.[1] The two works represent the extreme poles of New Testament writings: the Apocalypse being the most Judaistic of all, and the Gospel the least so. Modern criticism, especially the school of Schleiermacher, had recognized this distinction, and framed a syllogism with the *minor premise*, 'John is the author of the Gospel,' and the conclusion, 'John is not, therefore, the author of the Apocalypse.' The Tübingen school inverted the *minor* and derived the conclusion, 'John is not, therefore, the author of the Gospel;' and if one of the two works must have had the Apostle for an author, it is on all grounds much more likely to have been the Apocalypse than the Gospel. This view is further supported by the original Asiatic tradition on the Paschal controversy.[2]

---

[8] Cf. Lecture III. pp. 123 sqq.

[9] *Hist. Eccles.* vii. 25.

[1] *Leben Jesu, ut supra*, pp. 72, 73.

Summary.

To sum up, if we start from our knowledge of John, we do not arrive at the Fourth Gospel; and if we start from our knowledge of the Fourth Gospel, we are in danger of not arriving, or rather, we shall not arrive at S. John.

The result of the examination of the sources of the life of Jesus is that for the Synoptics, considering the interval of several generations between the events which they relate and the final form which they assumed, the possibility of legendary and fabulous traces must be admitted; while for the Fourth Gospel the alloy of philosophic speculation and conscious fiction is more than possible—it is probable.[3]

Returns later to the question.

At a later stage in the work Strauss returns to the Johannine question, and examines briefly the position of Bretschneider, Schleiermacher, Weisse, Schweizer, Renan, Baur and his school.[4] He sees clearly that no intermediate position is possible. When Baur came on the field the Gospel had challenged criticism to a duel to the death. She must break up her armour and place the *débris* at the foot of the Gospel, or else she must deprive the Gospel of all historic authority and prove it to be a work posterior to the Apostles; and when so considered to be as clear as it is incomprehensible when it claims to be by an Apostle. To have undertaken this combat, and to have carried it through as such combats seldom have been carried through, he regards as the imperishable glory of Baur.[5]

---

[2] *Leben Jesu, ut supra*, pp. 76, 77.

[3] *Ibid.* pp. 77–79.

[4] *Ibid.* pp. 90–94, and 98 sqq.

Strauss's critique is really that of the Tübingen school.

Such in brief outline is the critical foundation, as far as it affects the Fourth Gospel, of Strauss's new *Life of Jesus*. Reverence for an adversary so renowned compels us to take it into our account, but it is not necessary for us at this moment to consider it at any length. It is like the work itself—new and not new. It is by Strauss, and not by Strauss. The critical part is essentially a presentation of the later results of the Tübingen school, as the support of his own earlier theories; and the author avowedly bases them upon the labour of this school. Some of them have met us already; others will meet us again; not a few of them almost provoke a smile as we hear them. And this was the highest result of criticism only a quarter of a century ago!

But when Strauss had thus set forth the results of the criticism of Baur and his school as the foundation of his own work, it became necessary to see that the older superstructure could be fitted on to this new foundation.

The older work will not fit on this new critique.

He tells us that in his *Critical Examination of the Life of Jesus* he had arrived at the Fourth Gospel by way of the other three, which had served him as a point of departure and had helped him to understand the Fourth. His fundamental conception of what he calls the fictitious element of the Gospels was that of

---

[5] *Leben Jesu*, p. 108. Cf. Lecture V. pp. 230 sqq.

myth; and by myth he understood the so-called historic wrapping, which certain original conceptions of Christianity had received from the spontaneous fiction of legend. But this formula which he had derived from his study of the fictitious elements of the Synoptics, did not quite adapt itself to the Fourth Gospel. It was necessary to enlarge it, and to replace spontaneous fiction by arbitrary and conscious fiction. Baur's study of the Fourth Gospel started, however, from the idea of a free composition of religious speculation, the fundamental notion of which was to oppose to the divine principle of light and life, incarnate in Jesus, Jewish incredulity considered as the principle of darkness; and the plan consisted in following step by step the struggle of the two principles and in presenting it in the form of historic drama. This, Strauss tells us, was Baur's fundamental notion, from which he tried to deduce the distinctive marks which separate the Fourth Gospel from the other three, both as to its composition and its choice and arrangement of the evangelic material. He thinks it an admirable point of view for the Fourth Gospel, but that it is not equally applicable to the other three, and that in consistently applying it to them Baur is sometimes driven to arbitrary expedients.[6]

Conscious and unconscious fiction.

Strauss and Baur.

But Strauss is not quite happy about this union of his own fundamental conception of *myth* with Baur's fundamental conception of *purpose*, and in a later section he returns to discuss generally the notion of myth.[7]

---

[6] *Leben Jesu, ut supra*, pp. 108, 109.

Re-writing of the theory of myth.

In the earlier work he had presented myth as the key of the miraculous records and of other historical difficulties in the Gospels. It was loss of time and trouble, he used to say, to try and reduce stories like that of the star of the Magi, and the transfiguration, and the multiplication of the loaves to the order of natural events ; and, as it was equally impossible to admit the reality of facts so contrary to the laws of nature, it was necessary to take these records for poetic fictions. And when he had to account for the appearance of these fictions at the period of the Gospels, he found the key in the Messianic expectation.[8] As soon as a number of persons saw in Jesus the Messiah, they easily persuaded themselves that all the prophecies and figures of the Old Testament, with the addition of the Rabbinic interpretations, must find their fulfilment in Jesus. Everybody knew that Jesus was born at Nazareth, but the Messiah must in accord with the prophecy of Micah be born at Bethlehem. Tradition had preserved strong words of Jesus against the Jewish love of miracles ; but Moses had wrought miracles, and Jesus must be made to work miracles too. Isaiah had foretold that in the Messianic period the blind should see, the deaf hear, and so on. The very details of the miracles of the Messiah were marked out, and there grew up naturally in the early Christian community unconscious fictions that these works had been actually wrought by Jesus.

---

[7] *Leben Jesu*, p. 150.

[8] *Ibid.* vol. i. pp. 72 sqq. of ed. 1 ; pp. 91 sqq. of ed. 4.

Bruno Bauer, 1809–1882.

This was the fundamental principle of Strauss's earlier work, but nearly thirty years have now passed, and meanwhile Bruno Bauer has been trying to prove that the Messianic idea, so far from being wholly rooted in Jewish theology, took its rise only with John Baptist, and attained definite proportions only about the late date of the composition of the Gospels, and then not among Jews but among Christians;[9] while Volkmar has asserted a middle position and is not prepared to go so far as Strauss in the pre-Christian details of the Messianic idea.[1]

Volkmar.

And there comes back once again the difficulty which more especially concerns our present subject. Strauss sees that he cannot apply the view of myth which suited the simple and legendary poetry of the earlier Gospels to what he calls the more or less conscious inventions like those of the Fourth Gospel. He tries to justify himself by the usage of the older writers on myths down to Heyne. Modern mythologists, and especially Welcker, had reserved the term *myth* for the primitive, natural, unconscious legend; but the earlier writers who had created the term, had applied it to all religious traditions which were not historical, whatever their source was. And while Welcker's distinction is good as between fictions

Earlier and later theories of myth.

---

[9] *Leben Jesu, ut supra*, p. 150. *Kritik der Evangeliengeschichte der Synoptiker*, vol. i. pp. 181, 391–416.

[1] *Die Religion Jesu*, pp. 112 sqq.

which all admit, as in Greek history, the critic of the Gospels has to ask, in the face of assertions that they are historically true, not what is the distinction between myths and myths, not whether the Evangelist is consciously or unconsciously a poet, but whether his narrative is poetry or history.[2]

Strauss's disappointment.

Strauss is disappointed to find that his theory of myth is after one generation really dead, and the depth of his disappointment is read in the bitterness of his words. Ewald he believes to be really a disciple of the mythical school, who banishes the terms myth and mythical from the whole domain of Biblical exegesis only because he had not first thought of it himself. He quotes with approval the opinion of an English writer that Ewald is one 'to whom the celebrity of any opinion not emanating from himself is sufficient reason for condemning and contradicting it,' who 'wraps his virtue in an obscurity of inflated verbiage,' and who acts on the maxim 'Denounce your adversary in unmeasured terms for what he says, and then in slightly varying language quietly adopt his suggestions,'[3] and is not sorry to see how well the great man of Göttingen is known on the English side of the Channel.[4]

His view of Ewald,

and Baur.

He is not pleased even with Baur, upon whom he is seeking to support himself, for though Baur has not absolutely excluded myth from the evangelic history, he avoids it as much as possible and speaks of the theory of myth as the complete opposite of his own. Strauss thinks that he is playing the *rôle* of a conservative at his own expense, and naturally does not quite see what right he has to do so. In this new *Leben Jesu*, having regard to the results of Baur, Strauss has made more prominent the idea of intentional and conscious fiction, but he still clings to the earlier terminology of myth with the tenacity of a man who loves his own idea as a mother loves her child, and even when it is wounded—dead—loves it yet the more, and declares it cannot be dead and shall not die.[5]

---

[2] *Leben Jesu, ut supra*, pp. 156, 157.

[3] Mackay, *The Tübingen School and its Antecedents*, 1863, pp. 343, 345, 351, note. But cf. pp. 250 sq.

[4] *Leben Jesu, ut supra*, p. 158.

The mythical theory dead.

But it was dead. Baur was right. His own position was the very antipodes of that of Strauss, and a man cannot stand upright on both sides of the globe at the same moment.

Myth cannot live with Design.

The new work came too late. It is slain by the very strength to which it clings. Myth cannot be conscious and unconscious. Unconscious Myth cannot live in the embrace of deliberate Design. Strauss cannot support himself on Baur, even if Baur be willing that he should. It must be a duel to the death, and as between those combatants no one doubts who remains the victor, though the giant generously keeps the button on his foil. *Strauss darf und soll nicht kommen!* is now the watchword, not of the burghers of Zürich led by their clergy, but of the thinkers of

---

[5] *Leben Jesu, ut supra*, p. 159.

Christendom led by their most eminent scientific teachers of every shade of opinion. And while scientific opinion was thus convinced that the mythical theory of the Gospels was at an end, the lighter popular opinion that had fed upon Strauss was caught by the new work of M. Renan which had appeared the previous year, and had substituted a theory of legend for that of myth, and had placed the Fourth Gospel at the close of the first century.[6]

Renan's theory of legend.

Strauss has no further word to speak on the criticism of the Fourth Gospel. It is not for us to dwell therefore on later words, which both from their intellectual contradictions and their unbalanced tone were a shock even to his friends. It is not for us to dwell on the lessons of a *vie manquée*. We have one conclusion to draw which cannot be questioned. Strauss makes no substantial addition to the destructive attack on the Fourth Gospel. His sketch of criticism which I have briefly set before you is, as we have just seen, nothing more than a presentation of the extremer views of the Tübingen school as the foundation of a position which that school had shattered.[7] I will not further claim that Baur and Strauss stand on

Strauss makes no substantial addition to the criticism.

---

[6] Cf. Lecture V. pp. 255 sq.

[7] Cf. Lecture V. *passim*. Strauss himself quotes the following authors as his authorities:—Bretschneider, *Probabilia*, pp. 178 sqq.; Baur, *Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien*, pp. 349 sqq.; Zeller, *Die äusseren Zeugnisse,—Theol. Jahrbücher*, 1845 and 1847; Hilgenfeld, *Die Evangelien*, pp. 344 sqq.; *Die Evangelien Justins*, pp. 292 sqq.

different sides of the equation and cancel each other, though such claim may be in some measure sustained, because I regard Baur, in general mental grasp, and in special criticism of this Gospel, as beyond all comparison greater than Strauss.

With Baur and those who more or less closely followed him, it will be my duty to deal in the next lecture.

LECTURE V

'OUR AGE'

BAUR: THE TÜBINGEN SCHOOL. OTHER NEGATIVE THEORIES

THESE PROFESSORS ARE UNDER STRONG TEMPTATIONS TO PRODUCE NEW THEORIES IN BIBLICAL CRITICISM, THEORIES MARKED BY VIGOUR AND RIGOUR; AND FOR THIS PURPOSE TO ASSUME THAT THINGS CAN BE KNOWN WHICH CANNOT, TO TREAT POSSIBILITIES AS IF THEY WERE CERTAINTIES, TO MAKE SYMMETRY WHERE ONE DOES NOT FIND IT, AND SO TO LAND BOTH THE TEACHER, AND THE LEARNER WHO TRUSTS TO HIM, IN THE MOST FANCIFUL AND UNSOUND CONCLUSIONS. THERE ARE FEW WHO DO NOT SUCCUMB TO THEIR TEMPTATIONS, AND BAUR, I THINK, HAS SUCCUMBED TO THEM.

'EVEN WHILE ACKNOWLEDGING THE LEARNING, TALENT, AND SERVICES OF THESE CRITICS, I INSIST UPON THEIR RADICAL FAULTS; BECAUSE, AS OUR TRADITIONAL THEOLOGY BREAKS UP, GERMAN CRITICISM OF THE BIBLE IS LIKELY TO BE STUDIED HERE MORE AND MORE, AND TO THE UNTRAINED READER ITS VIGOROUS AND RIGOROUS THEORIES ARE, IN MY OPINION, A REAL DANGER. THEY IMPOSE UPON HIM BY THEIR BOLDNESS AND NOVELTY. TO HIS PRACTICAL HOLD ON THE BIBLE THEY CONDUCE NOTHING, BUT RATHER DIVERT FROM IT; AND YET THEY ARE OFTEN FARTHER FROM THE TRUTH, ALL THE WHILE, THAN EVEN THE TRADITIONAL VIEW WHICH THEY PROFESS TO ANNIHILATE.'

Matthew Arnold.

LECTURE V.

And not even so did their witness agree together.—Mark xiv. 59.

The new Tübingen school.

When the theological world was startled by the appearance of Strauss's *Life of Jesus*, there was at least one man to whom it caused no surprise. Ferdinand Christian Baur foresaw what was coming from his former pupil, and he had often spoken to him about it. The results of his own more matured judgment were given to the world after those of Strauss, and he naturally occupies a later place in our studies; but he was by sixteen years an older man. The son of a Würtemberg village pastor, born at Schmieden, near Stuttgart, in 1792, he came to Blaubeuren when only eight years old, his father having been appointed to the office of deacon of the parish. At the age of thirteen he, too, went to the seminary there; and afterwards to the University of Tübingen. You will remember, perhaps, from our study of Strauss how close the connexion between the little seminary and the university was; how, when Strauss went to Blaubeuren, he had Baur to teach him; and how in Tübingen he was again the pupil of the newly-made professor. Baur inherited and adopted the

Baur, 1792–1860.

Evangelical sympathies.

evangelical traditions of both school and university.[1] His first published work was an essay on Kaiser's *Biblical Theology* in Bengel's *Archives*,[2] and so little did he openly break with the current views of the time and place, that he was not only Professor of Historical Theology, but also Regent of the *Stift* or hostel, which was the usual residence of Protestant students who were being trained for the ministry, and he took a warm interest in it to the day of his death. Like all foremost minds among theological students of that day, he was largely influenced by the teaching of Schleiermacher,[3] and the impulse of this master is felt in his first important work *Symbolics and Mythology*.[4] Like Strauss, he passed from Schleiermacher to Hegel, and, like Strauss, he carried into all his after work, with unflinching adhesion, the principles of the Hegelian *Left*. Unlike Strauss, his life was one great whole. He spent nearly sixty years at Blaubeuren and Tübingen, and for more than thirty years, that is, from 1826 to 1860, fulfilled the duties of his professorship with consistent devotion. The chair, you will remember, was that of Historical Theology, and to this subject, in all the length and breadth of its extent, the energy of his rarely equalled powers was devoted. Few men ever worked so

Influenced by Schleiermacher and Hegel.

Work at Blaubeuren and Tübingen.

---

[1] Cf. Dr. Karl Klüpfel's *Geschichte und Beschreibung der Universität Tübingen*, 1849. The sections on the Evangelical Theological Faculty and the Evangelical Seminary, from Storr onwards, pp. 389–457, are by Baur.

[2] *Archiv für Theologie*, ii. 656.

[3] Cf. Lecture VI. p. 300.

[4] *Die Symbolik und Mythologie, oder die Naturreligion des Alterthums*, 3 vols., 1824–5.

hard; four o'clock in the morning, winter and summer, was his hour for rising. Few men ever produced so much. Few men ever attained, and fewer have preserved, so high a standard of excellence. He is not, like Strauss, carried away, and he does not carry his readers away, by the mere beauty of thought or form. I doubt whether his readers are often carried away at all. It is for ordinary people hard enough work to keep up with him. It is sometimes not unlike walking across a ploughed field. It is a ploughed field. He has been working at virgin soil, has been right through it from end to end, and has turned over every inch of the ground; but the walking is not very easy, and some of us may well be thankful to men stronger than ourselves who have walked in front of us, and have here and there made paths across it.

Extent of his literary work.

Let us look for a moment at the extent of the field in which this one man has done pioneer work. I have already referred to an important early book. The following is a list of his other writings in chronological order. It is probably not quite complete, but is sufficiently so for our purpose:—

Books,

1. *On the Derivation of Ebionitism, or the Christ-Party at Corinth.*[5]
2. *On Manichæism.*[6]
3. *On the Opposition between Protestantism and Catholicism*, in answer to Möhler's *Symbolics.*[7]

---

[5] *Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde u.s.w.*, *Zeitschrift für Theologie*, 1831, iv. 61, and 1836, iv. 1.

[6] *Geschichte des Manichäismus*, 1831.

[7] *Gegensatz des Katholicismus und des Protestantismus*, 1834.

4. *On Christian Gnosis, or the Christian Philosophy of Religion.*[8]

5. *On the so-called Pastoral Epistles of the Apostle Paul.*[9]

6. *Time and Occasion of the Epistle to the Romans.*[1]

7. *On the Origin of the Episcopate.*[2]

8. *History of the Doctrine of the Atonement.*[3]

9. *History of the Doctrine of the Trinity and the Incarnation of God* (3 vols.).[4]

10. *Paul the Apostle of Jesus Christ.*[5]

11. *Critical Examination of the Canonical Gospels, their Relation to each other, their Origin and Character.*[6]

12. *Manual of the History of Dogmas*;[7] enlarged in the posthumous

13. *Lectures on the History of Christian Dogmas.*[8]

14. *The Gospel of Mark.*[9]

15. *On the Epochs of Church History.*[1]

16. *Church History of the First Three Centuries.*[2]

And the important posthumous works:

17. *Church History from the Fourth to the Sixth Century.*[3]

18. *Church History of the Middle Ages.*[4]

19. *Modern Church History.*[5]

---

[8] *Die christliche Gnosis, oder die christliche Religionsphilosophie*, 1835.

[9] *Die sogenannten Pastoralbriefe des Apostels Paulus u.s.w.*, 1835.

[1] *Ueber Zweck u. Veranlassung des Römerbriefs u.s.w.*, *Zeitschrift für Theologie*, 1836, iii. 59.

[2] *Ueber den Ursprung des Episcopats*, 1838.

[3] *Geschichte der Lehre von der Versöhnung*, 1838.

[4] *Geschichte der Lehre von der Dreieinigkeit und Menschwerdung Gottes*, 1841–3, 3 vols.

[5] *Paulus der Apostel Jesu Christi*, 1845 and 1866.

[6] *Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien u.s.w.*, 1847.

[7] *Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmengeschichte*, 1847.

[8] *Vorlesungen über die christliche Dogmengeschichte*, 1865–7, 3 vols.

[9] *Das Marcusevangelium*, 1851.

[1] *Die Epochen der kirchlichen Geschichtschreibung*, 1852.

[2] *Die christliche Kirche der drei ersten Jahrhunderte*, 1853.

[3] *Die christliche Kirche vom 4ten bis zum 6ten Jahrhundert*, 1859.

[4] *Die christliche Kirche des Mittelalters*, 1861.

[5] *Die christliche Kirche der neuern Zeit*, 1863.

20. *Church History of the Nineteenth Century.*[6]

21. *Lectures on the Theology of the New Testament.*[7]

and shorter writings.

Besides these there were numerous articles in the *Tübingen Review*, in Zeller's *Year-book*, and, after 1857, in Hilgenfeld's *Review*. Some of these shorter writings are of primary importance for our own study; for example:—

22. *On the Composition and Character of the Johannine Gospel.*[8]

23. *The Johannine Epistles.*[9]

24. *Introduction to the New Testament.*[1]

25. *The Johannine Question and the Latest Answers.*[2]

26. *Answer to Dr. Karl Hase's Letter on the Tübingen School.*[3]

27. *On Johannine Questions: Justin Martyr and the Paschal Controversy.*[4]

28. *Reply to Dr. Steitz on the Paschal Controversy of the Early Church.*[5]

29. *The Tübingen School and its Present Position, a Reply to Weisse, Weizsäcker, and Ewald,*[6] the second edition of which appeared but a short time before the author's death.

---

[6] *Die christliche Kirche des* 19*ten Jahrhunderts*, 1862, ed. 2, 1877.

[7] *Vorlesungen über neutestamentliche Theologie*, 1864.

[8] *Ueber die Composition und den Charakter des Johanneischen Evangelium*, *Theologische Jahrbücher*, 1844.

[9] *Die Johanneische Briefe u.s.w.*, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1848.

[1] *Die Einleitung in das Neue Testament u.s.w.*, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1850, 1851.

[2] *Die Johanneische Frage u. ihre neuesten Beantwortungen*, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1854.

[3] *An Herrn Dr. Karl Hase u.s.w.*, *Beantwortung des Sendschreibens—die Tübinger Schule*, 1855.

[4] *Zur Johanneischen Frage*: 1. *Ueber Justin d. M. gegen Luthardt.* 2. *Ueber den Paschastreit gegen Steitz*, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1857.

[5] *Entgegnung gegen Herrn Dr. G. E. Steitz über den Paschastreit der alten Kirche*, *Zeitsch. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1858.

[6] *Die Tübinger Schule u. ihre Stellung zur Gegenwart*, 1859, ed. 2, 1860.

There is the field. Where are the paths across it? Baur has himself made one such path in his sketch of *Church History in the Nineteenth Century*,[7] which was edited after his death by Dr. Zeller. It is little to the credit of English theology that, while so much of Strauss was soon translated, no work of Baur's appeared in English until, by the aid of the Theological Translation Fund,[8] *Paul the Apostle* was translated in 1873–5, and *The Church History of the First Three Centuries* in 1878–9. These are both paths that we may safely walk on. The *Paul the Apostle* is, as we shall see, a necessity for the understanding of Baur's work. The *First Three Centuries* is his own summary of his chief positions. The second German edition of this work was published in the year in which he died. The English translation is from the third edition issued three years afterwards, and it therefore represents in convenient form the author's latest views.

Baur's method of investigation.

Baur arrived at his criticism of the Fourth Gospel by an altogether different road from that of Strauss. He had commenced his investigations long before his pupil. His studies of the two Corinthian Epistles first led him to a careful examination of the Apostle Paul's relation to the older Apostles. He was convinced that the Epistles themselves gave sufficient *data* for concluding that the older and commonly accepted view of an entire harmony must be abandoned, and that there was really an opposition which went so far that the Jewish Christians questioned S. Paul's authority. A more exact examination of the pseudo-Clementine Homilies, which he, following Neander, brought into prominence as important for the earliest history, left him with a deeper impression of the significance of this opposition in the post-Apostolic period. And it became more and more clear that the opposition of the two parties, the Pauline and the Petrine or Judaistic—which must, he thinks, be distinguished much more sharply than has hitherto been done, in both the Apostolic and post-Apostolic period—had a marked influence not only on the form of the Petrine speeches, but also on the composition of the Acts of the Apostles. The first results of these investigations he published in the *Tübingen Review* in 1831.[9]

---

[7] *Die christliche Kirche, ut supra*, 1862 and 1877.

[8] *Theological Translation Fund Library*, 1873, etc.

Pauline and Petrine parties.

His examination of the doctrine of Gnosis led him to the Pastoral Epistles, with the result that, in 1835, he published his reasons for believing that they were not the work of the Apostle Paul, but that they sprung from the same party tendency which, in the second century, was the ruling formative principle of the Church. Continued occupation with the Pauline Epistles, and a deeper steeping in the spirit of the Apostles and of Pauline Christianity, fixed more and more the opinion that there was an essential difference between the four chief Epistles of S. Paul and the

Four Pauline Epistles.

---

[9] *Kirchengeschichte des 19ten Jahrhunderts*, ed. 2, 1877, p. 417. Cf. *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie*, 1831, 4tes Heft.

shorter ones, and that the authenticity of several, if not all, of these latter was very doubtful. These results he carried out and published in his treatise on *Paul the Apostle*, quite independently of Strauss.

He had now brought into the field of history a period which by dogmatic prepossession had been up to this time excluded from it. Admit Ebionitism and Paulinism as the factors of the historic formation of this period, and all is clear. And, in spite of opposing voices, he believes he is justified in affirming that the old and groundless views of the closed unity of the Canon were for ever destroyed.[1]

Thus ended the first period of Baur's critical labours.

At first took no part in the 'Johannine question.'

When Strauss's *Life of Jesus* appeared, Baur remained during the general agitation a silent observer. He knew all about it before it was published, as we have seen, but he refrained from taking any part in the discussion, because he had not yet made the deeper studies which he felt to be necessary. But when he had made the Johannine Gospel the subject of a course of lectures, he felt himself able to introduce a new and independent position with regard to the evangelical history. The fundamental distinction of this Gospel from the Synoptics was so convincing, that he at once formed the opinion that it also was a 'tendency-writing,' the earliest possible date for which was A.D. 160, and he published this opinion in the

Considered it to be a 'tendency-writing.'

---

[1] *Kirchengeschichte, ut supra*, pp. 117, 118.

Theological Year-book for 1844.[2] There he felt was a new platform gained for the criticism of the evangelical history. If the Fourth Gospel is no historical writing like the others, if it has undoubtedly an ideal tendency, then it can no longer be placed by the side of the Synoptics, and opposed to them. The Straussian tactics and method of operation—to slay on the one hand the Synoptics by John, and on the other hand John by the Synoptics, with the result that no one knows when to stop—are no more possible.[3] Baur is careful to add that he does not mean to assert that we have in the Synoptics a purely historical presentation, but that we have in them an altogether different historical basis from that which we have in John.[4] But the question then presents itself to him, If once one of the Canonical Gospels is shown to be a tendency-writing of a very definite kind, ought not one or more of the Synoptic Gospels to be placed in the same category? This leads to a fuller examination of the Gospel of Luke, which was published in the *Theological Year-book* for 1846.[5] These investigations of the Gospels were united in one volume in 1847, and this formed the second chief work on the criticism of the New Testament.[6]

Application

The narrower the circle is thus made in which of the principle to the 'mythical theory.'

---

[2] *Theologische Jahrbücher.* Tübingen, 1844.

[3] Cf. Strauss's objection to this statement by Baur, *Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk bearbeitet*, 1864, pp. 61 sqq.; and Lecture IV. pp. 212 sqq.

[4] *Kirchengeschichte*, *ut supra*, p. 419.

[5] *Theologische Jahrbücher*, 1846.

[6] *Kritische Untersuchungen*, *ut supra*, 1847.

the original tradition of the Gospels is to be sought, the simpler and easier, in Baur's opinion, becomes the business of the critic. The whole question is now centred in the Matthew Gospel. The widely extended mythical theory of Strauss is reduced to narrow dimensions. Once make it certain that some of our Canonical Gospels are to be regarded as 'tendency-writings,' and the question arises whether, where hitherto myth has been supposed to be necessary, the tradition has been modified in the interest of the author's literary tendency, or else is pure fiction. As the tendency, which must be recognized to be the specific character of some of the Gospels, can have its ground only in the peculiar circumstances in which their authors wrote, that is, in the party divisions which existed among them, so the standpoint for the criticism of the Gospels is to be found only in the whole sphere in which such phenomena manifest themselves. We must not draw the historical circle too narrow, and it is obvious how important it is, not only in the Apostolic, but also in the post-Apostolic period, to take cognizance of everything which can give more exact knowledge of the different directions in which divisions took place.

Combination of results.

These investigations of the Gospels naturally attach themselves to the earlier conclusions from the Pauline Epistles. There is the foundation and firm support. On the other hand, the post-Apostolic periods, of which our Canonical Gospels are the products, contribute to the presentation of a clearer and concrete form.[7]

Three stages: (1) to A.D. 70. The documents.

There are three stages of the development :—

The first period extends to the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. The documents are, the First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians, Galatians, Romans—these four and only these four being genuine Pauline Epistles—and the Apocalypse, which is certainly the work of John, and represents an original Ebionite Christianity in opposition to Paulinism.

(2) A.D. 70–140. The documents.

The second period extends from A.D. 70 to 140. The documents are, first the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, which belong to the Jewish wars under Hadrian, then the Acts of the Apostles, the Gospel of Mark, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the pseudo-Pauline Epistles, and finally the Catholic Epistles. The characteristics of this period are the first endeavours on both sides towards moderating the antagonism. The Jewish Christians no longer insisted upon the requirements of circumcision. The Pauline party were anxious to heal the breach, and hence sprung the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians.

(3) From A.D. 140. The documents.

The third period extends from A.D. 140. The extremes of the Ebionites on the one hand, and of the Gnostics on the other were now abandoned. This is marked in practice by the Roman church and the watchword 'Peter and Paul,' and in idea by the

---

[7] *Kirchengeschichte, ut supra*, p. 420.

Fourth Gospel. The documents of this period are the Pastoral Epistles and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles.[8]

The Johannine Gospel.

The Johannine Gospel is represented as being most clearly of all the result of a deliberate second-century purpose. On both the great questions of theological discussion which troubled the Church in the second century, Gnosticism and the Paschal controversy, it is an obvious re-writing of the original evangelic tradition from a point of view which represents in time, A.D. 160 or 170, and in place Asia Minor, or more probably Alexandria. The authenticity of the Gospel is, indeed, for Baur not the main question. The tendency and the character of the writing are essential to his position.

Followers of Baur:

Nor did Baur stand alone as Strauss did. The chief teacher in the University of Tübingen had attracted an enthusiastic circle of disciples, and these formed a cluster around him, each one taking his own special line, and all contributing to the strength of the master's position. A title which had formerly belonged to the leaders of evangelical pietism was, from local connexion, naturally transferred to them, and this new Tübingen school became an important factor in the theological history of the nineteenth century. A course of lectures would be needed for even an outline of its history. I shall not attempt it in a small part of one. Let me only remind you that the group was illumined by the brilliancy of

---

[8] Cf. Holtzmann, H. J., *Einleitung*, ed. 2, 1886, pp. 188 sq.

Albert Schwegler, who had already prepared the way by a history of Montanism,[9] and by criticisms on Lücke and Bruno Bauer,[1] and now presented to the world the first graphic, perhaps too graphic, account of the master's teaching;[2] that it was supported in its earlier years, though not without criticism, by the grave and solid learning of Albrecht Ritschl, who contributed works on *The Gospel of Marcion and the Canonical Gospel of Luke*,[3] and the *Origin of the Old Catholic Church*;[4] by the prolific Adolf Hilgenfeld, now Professor at Jena, and editor, from its commencement in 1857, of the *Journal for Scientific Theology* which bears his name,[5] who wrote early works on *The Clementine Recognitions and Homilies*,[6] *The Gospel and Epistle of John*,[7] *The Gospel of Mark*,[8] *Primitive Christianity*,[9] and is now, perhaps, best known by his valuable *Introduction to the New Testament*;[1] by the Tübingen colleague, Köstlin, who wrote *On the Johannine System of Doctrine*,[2] and *On the Origin and Composition of the Synoptic Gospels*,[3]

Schwegler, 1819–1857.

Ritschl, 1822–1889.

Hilgenfeld, 1823–

Köstlin, 1819—

---

[9] *Der Montanismus und die christliche Kirche des 2ten Jahrhunderts*, 1841.

[1] *Theologische Jahrbücher*, 1842.

[2] *Das nachapostolische Zeitalter in den Hauptmomenten seiner Entwicklung*, 2 vols. 1845–1846.

[3] *Das Evangelium Marcions und das kanonische Evangelium des Lucas*, 1846.

[4] *Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche*, 1850.

[5] *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie.*

[6] *Die clementinischen Recognitionen und Homilien*, 1848.

[7] *Das Evangelium und die Briefe Johannis nach ihrem Lehrbegriff*, 1849.

[8] *Das Marcusevangelium*, 1850.

[9] *Das Urchristenthum*, 1855.

[1] *Historisch-kritische Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 1875.

[2] *Der Lehrbegriff des Evangeliums und der Briefe Johannis*, 1843.

[3] *Der Ursprung und die Komposition der synoptischen Evangelien*, 1853.

and also did good service in the reviews;[4] by the Volkmar, 1809– Zürich professor, Volkmar, whose special work in relation to the earlier days of the school was to meet objections from quotations in Marcion, Justin, and the Clementines, and afterwards to represent its extreme Left;[5] Holsten, 1825– by the Heidelberg professor, Holsten, who came later into the field and has devoted his thoughts chiefly to the special position of Pauline theology;[6] and, chief of all the early band, though he in later years, like Schwegler, retired from the teaching of theology to undertake that of philosophy, came Zeller, 1814– the Berlin professor, Eduard Zeller, Baur's pupil at Blaubeuren and Tübingen, and afterwards his son-in-law, the friend, editor, and biographer of Strauss, editor of portions of Baur's works, editor from 1842 to 1857 of the *Theological Year-book*[7] which bears his name, and contributor of some of the chief articles[8] in it, author of a short *History of the Church*,[9] and of a treatise on the *Acts of the Apostles*,[1] which, apart from its special theories, is a work of ripe and careful scholarship and of permanent value.

---

[4] *Theologische Jahrbücher*, 1850, 1851.

[5] *Das Evangelium Marcions*, 1852; *Ueber Justin den Märtyrer*, 1853; *Ein neu entdecktes Zeugniss: Theologische Jahrbücher*, 1854, pp. 446–462; *Die Religion Jesu*, 1857, cap. viii.; *Der Ursprung unserer Evangelien*, 1866, pp. 91–110.

[6] *Zum Evangelium des Paulus und des Petrus*, 1868; *Das Evangelium des Paulus*, 1881; *Die drei ursprünglichen noch ungeschriebenen Evangelien*, 1883.

[7] *Theologische Jahrbücher*, 1842–1857.

[8] See especially *Die äusseren Zeugnisse über das Dasein und den Ursprung des vierten Evangeliums*, 1845, pp. 577–656. (The Fourth Gospel cannot be traced back beyond A.D. 170.) *Einige weitere Bemerkungen über die äussere Bezeugung des vierten Evangeliums*, 1847, pp. 136–174. *Ueber die Citate aus dem vierten Evangelium in den Philos Origenis*, 1853, pp. 144–152. *Noch ein Wort über den Ausspruch Jesu bei Justin Apol.*, i. 61, 1855, pp. 138–140. And four important articles—*Das Urchristenthum*, *Die Tübinger historische Schule*, *Ferdinand Christian Baur*, *Strauss und Renan*—reprinted in *Vorträge und Abhandlungen*, 2nd ed. 1875.

Never was theory supported by more learning, ability, or enthusiasm. Never did theory more entirely collapse. If we look at it we shall, I think, find little difficulty in explaining the failure.

Baur bound by the Hegelian *Left*.

The foundations of Baur's edifice are the principles of the Hegelian *Left*, for, like many another disciple of Hegel, the moment he had embraced these principles he was fettered by them. The wonderful skill and untiring work of which I have spoken was, after all, slave-labour. His field is cultivated as field hardly ever was, but it is in the narrow valley in which the master placed him. Mentally, as well as physically, he never left Tübingen; he never got beyond his work, so as to look at it from without; and a stripling who will ascend the hills on either side can see this giant working in his narrow valley as though it were the universe; while mountain rises above mountain and beyond the horizon there are hills and valleys of which none of us have ever thought, in the vast infinity of the universe of God. But the Hegelian trichotomy draws the limit beyond which Baur cannot go. Thesis, antithesis, momentum, higher unity—this is the law which is to explain all things in heaven and earth, and the waters which are above and beneath them.

---

[9] *Geschichte der christlichen Kirche*, 1848.

[1] *Die Apostelgeschichte nach ihrem Inhalt und Ursprung kritisch untersucht*, 1854.

Development of philosophy.

Meanwhile philosophy has been claiming its own development, and has asserted that Hegel is not its last prophet. This assertion has perhaps been made more loudly in Germany than in England. It has been said that there are more Hegelians in Oxford than there are in Berlin. It has been said that Oxford is the happy place to which good German philosophies hope to go—after they are dead; but this was by an enemy. The life at Oxford is too vigorous to be affected by anything which is dead. But other places and persons are not always so blessed, and the corpses of not a few dead theories have lately been sent about the country; and, now galvanized by science, now wire-pulled in ignorance like puppets are at country fairs, have seemed to be actually alive; and they have greatly terrified a good many innocent country people, and children of all ages who knew nothing about the batteries and could not see the wires.

Baur's theory an arch.

But whatever may be the present vitality of the Hegelian philosophy, of which I will not venture to speak, except to say that many of us at least have still much to learn from it in its own proper sphere, there can, I think, be little doubt about the edifice which the Tübingen school reared upon it. This edifice forms, let us remember, an arch. Every stone of the arch supports and is supported by its neighbour. The foundations on either side are, on the right, the four undoubted Pauline Epistles and the Apocalypse, dated before the year A.D. 70—there is your thesis, definite and fixed: on the left, Matthew and Luke, dated A.D. 130–140 — there your antithesis, equally definite and equally fixed. Then come the stones on either side: Acts, Mark, Hebrews, pseudo-Pauline letters, Catholic letters, Ephesians, Colossians. The pseudo-Clementines must have a place, for they suggested the whole thing, and show a middle stage of progress; the pastoral Epistles are so late that they come near the top of the arch; and finally, as the last stage of the development, the crown to which all leads on either side, the key which binds all together in unbroken and unbreakable unity,—the Johannine Gospel and Epistles.

The arch tested.

All this is very wonderful. It is like the structures one has seen in a dream. It is like the castle made of wooden blocks of stone in the nursery. It will hold together as long as you leave it alone, but you must not touch it to see if the stones are real. You would not be so cruel. They please the child. And were this structure simply a chapter in a novel, or a plan drawn upon paper, you would not touch it; but it is an arch over which you are asked to walk, and the abyss below is deeper than you can see. And when you begin to think of what these stones are, of the quarries from which they came, of their shape and size—for most of us after all do know something about the individual stones—you first wonder by what possible skill and contrivance they have found their place in this arch. There are some of the workmen about still, and we can ask them to explain the whole thing to us. But no, let us not put questions, or perhaps they will say by-and-by that they did not understand us, and that their answers therefore mean nothing. Let us take out our note-books and listen, and we may hear a good deal. There is a group looking at the foundation on which the first stones rest. They are not quite sure that it is all rock; indeed, there are serious signs of fissure and collapse. The Tübingen Schelling has been lecturing at Berlin in place of the Tübingen Hegel, and though Baur regarded the whole Schelling episode as a piece of excellent comedy,[2] it is surprising how able men believe in it. Trendelenburg has followed; Herbart and Lotze have been lecturing at Göttingen; Ulrici at Halle. Strange things have been said by the younger Fichte and others in the *Journal for Philosophy*.[3] What does it all mean? Can it be that Hegel is after all human clay, though it be of a very fine quality, and not eternal rock? But look, they say, at the enormous weight of this arch; nothing short of rock can possibly bear it.

The foundations doubted.

And there is Volkmar. We know what a clever workman he is, and how if we consult some pages

The workmen questioned:

---

[2] 'Das ganze Auftreten Schelling's in Berlin war ein wahrhaft komisches Schauspiel, das mit grossem Gepränge aufgeführt wurde. Eine Hauptrolle spielte dabei Neander.' *Kirchengeschichte des 19ten Jahrhunderts*, ed. 2, 1877, p. 405.

[3] *Zeitschrift für Philosophie*, founded in 1837 to oppose Hegelianism.

Volkmar,

of modern English writing—he is not now perhaps so much quoted in Germany—he appears as a chief authority on this arch. He is carefully measuring that big foundation stone on the left. What! there surely cannot be anything wrong there! But he is very much afraid there is. It is a thousand pities, for the whole process of development depends upon it. Yes! it is in the wrong place, it must come out. He has talked to a good many of his friends and they, especially Köstlin, agree with him.[4] The original Gospel is a primitive Mark,[5] and the date is probably A.D. 73.

Hilgenfeld,

There is Hilgenfeld, a workman who has done an enormous amount of good work on the arch itself and round about it. He is left in a sort of permanent charge and is a thoroughly honest man. As one of the original workmen, and now getting on for seventy years of age, anything he says is valuable, and if you listen you will have no difficulty in hearing a good deal, for he often talks about it. Look, he is now examining the foundation stone on the right. He says it is not quite safe. There are some awkward holes about it which must be filled up. First Thessalonians and Philippians and Philemon have by mistake been put in the wrong places, and must be taken out and put in here. Then he looks at the foundation stone on the left. It is very serious. Volkmar is right. The architect was really altogether wrong. His foundation is impossible. But Volkmar is also wrong; it is not a Mark which is wanted. That comes second. The first stone is Matthew, which exactly fits the place, and it comes from the Apostle himself from about A.D. 50–60, though it was a little retouched between A.D. 70–80. Then he looks at the spring of the arch and the key-stone. These too will have to be altered. The Clementines are much too early. John is much too late. He has talked to a great many workmen and they all agree with him that the Clementines come after John, except one whose name he does not know, and he is not a German.[6] Altering the key-stone of an arch is a very dangerous matter, but this really cannot remain as it is.[7]

---

[4] Köstlin, K. R., *Der Ursprung und die Komposition der synoptischen Evangelien*, 1853. See esp. pp. 310–385.

[5] Volkmar, *Die Religion Jesu und ihre erste Entwickelung*, 1857; *Der Ursprung unserer Evangelien*, 1866; *Marcus und die Synopses, u.s.w.*, 1869, 2te Aufl. 1876; *Jesus Nazarenus*, 1881 and 1882. See pp. 7 sq., and esp. the 'Chronological Survey of the written sources of the Life of Jesus,' on pp. 18 sqq.

Ritschl,

And there is—or rather we must say was, for he too has departed from us—the greatest workman of them all, Albrecht Ritschl. Hardly one of the regular workmen at any time, he built buttresses rather than the arch, but these gave the strength on which many rested. If you watch him, you will see that he has been pulling them down, and that the arch which had depended upon him is left without his strong support. Now that he has had time for further testing, he thinks that John belongs to the foundation, not to the crown.

---

[6] Cf. Lecture II. p. 84; and Lecture VII. pp. 374 sq.

[7] Hilgenfeld, *Die Evangelien nach ihrer Entstehung und geschichtlichen Bedeutung*, 1854; *Historisch-kritische Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 1875; *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1875, p. 582.

Listen to him :—

> In order to prevent misunderstandings, I would explain that I consider the Gospel to be authentic, not only because the denial of its authenticity raises far greater difficulties than its acceptance, but also because the presentation of the revelation of Jesus in the three other Gospels requires for its completion the discourses in John.[8]

Holsten.

Karl Holsten is almost the only other original workman, for Schwegler died many years since, after leaving this work, and Zeller long ago gave up arch-building of this kind. Holsten is said to have been the only faithful workman the architect had in his last days. He may have the plans and be able to put the whole right. But when we listen to him, we find that he also regards that left foundation stone as altogether wrong. It ought not to have been Ebionitism, it ought not to have been any one of the Canonical books. The only stone which will really fit the place and bear the structure is the gospel of Peter.[9]

And now having looked at this arch, let us try to interpret it. It does not represent too strongly the adhesion of the whole system of Baur, or the way in which that system is builded together into one organic whole; and it is impossible to remove any one of the interdepending stones, much more to touch one of the foundations or the key of the system, without bringing the structure to the ground. It lies before us, therefore, as a magnificent ruin, whose fall has been wrought by the tools of the builders themselves. A ruin, and therefore it is ignorance or worse than ignorance to speak of it in the present as a firm foundation on which we may in full confidence build our lives; but a magnificent ruin which no future architect can neglect to study, and from which he cannot fail to draw really great ideas, and from the stones of which have been gathered, and will be gathered, forms of fair and wondrous beauty, fit to take their place upon the eternal rock and to grace the temple of the Lord.

---

[8] 'Um Missdeutungen zu begegnen, erkläre ich, dass ich das Evangelium für echt halte, nicht nur, weil die Leugnung seiner Echtheit viel grössere Schwierigkeiten darbietet, als deren Anerkennung ; sondern auch weil die Darstellung der Verkündigung Jesu nach den drei anderen Evangelien ihre Ergänzung durch die Reden bei Johannes fordert.' Ritschl, *Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche*, 2te Aufl., 1857, pp. 48 sqq. See also *Theologische Jahrbücher*, 1851, pp. 500 sqq., and esp. *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*, 1861, pp. 429–459.

[9] Holsten, *Die drei ursprünglichen noch ungeschriebenen Evangelien*, 1883. *Die synoptischen Evangelien nach der Form ihres Inhalts*, 1885. See esp. pp. 165 sqq.

The arch a ruin.

French writers: Stap.

Perhaps we ought also to note that the methods and results of the school were presented to French readers by M. A. Stap, a Belgian writer, in a series of articles in the *Revue Germanique* which were afterwards republished in his *Historical and Critical Studies on the Sources of Christianity*, in 1864.[1] The fifth study deals with the Fourth Gospel, and presents it on the well-known principles of the school with little addition of fresh investigation or result. He finds everywhere a total absence of historical probability, and proof that it is in the fullest sense a work of theology and not one of history. It was unknown in the Church until after A.D. 155, when it began to attract attention, and was not written before the time of Valentinus, that is, after A.D. 130–140.

---

[1] *Études historiques et critiques sur les Origines du Christianisme,* Paris, 1864; ed. 2, 1866, pp. 232–348.

D'Eichthal, 1804–

M. Gustave d'Eichthal, author of a considerable work on *The Gospels*,[2] is a disciple of the same school, and in a striking preface devotes some pages to the Johannine question. He lays special stress on the anti-Jewish and mystic tone, and on the connexion between the Gospel and Gnosticism, in which, as well as in the view of its date, he is avowedly a follower of Hilgenfeld.

But neither of these French writers makes any material addition to the work of their German precursors.

German criticism of the Tübingen school:

Before passing from the Tübingen school, I should like, however, to present, not my own view of it, but that of two German writers, to whom I shall have to refer again,[3] and whose competence to speak on any question of New Testament criticism is fully admitted.

De Wette,

It is now more than forty years since the typically independent, and in the true sense freethinker, De Wette, wrote the following words :—

> It will perhaps disappoint many that I have not entered more fully into a refutation of Baur's destructive criticism;

---

[2] *Les Évangiles*, 1863. See esp. vol. i. Preface, pp. xxv sqq.

[3] Cf. Lecture VI. pp. 307 and 319.

but, on the one hand, this would have taken more space than I have at my command, and, on the other hand, I hold such a refutation to be superfluous. Such extravagant criticism is self-destructive, and its only value is that, by exceeding all limits, it must awaken the feeling of the necessity of self-restraint.[4]

Meyer.

And it is a quarter of a century ago since Meyer, the late veteran of New Testament commentators, summed up as follows the chief negative theories of that day :—

> We older men have already seen the time when Dr. Paulus and his inventions were in vogue; he died, and no disciple remained. We lived through the Strauss storm thirty years ago, and in what loneliness might the author now celebrate his jubilee. We saw the Tübingen constellation arise, and even before Baur departed hence the brightness had waned. A renewed and firmer basis of the truth which had been attacked, and a more complete recognition of it, were the blessings which the wave left behind; and so will it be after the present surge.[5]

The Partition Theories.

Side by side with the negative criticism of Evanson, Bretschneider, Strauss, and Baur, and extending indeed from the earliest days of the modern doubts about the Fourth Gospel until the present time, a line of writers has existed, more or less connected with each other, and more or less fully holding that portions of the Gospel are authentic, but that it is not as a whole the work of S. John. Among the first to express this view at the close of the last century was Jacob C. R. Eckermann,[6] who thought the most remarkable discourses were Johannine, and the connecting history was by one of his friends, but he afterwards retracted this opinion.[7] Christoph Friedrich von Ammon, in the Erlangen Programme of 1811,[8] sought to show 'that John the author of the Gospel is a different person from the editor.' Heinrich E. G. Paulus [9] thought John was witness and guarantee of the Gospel, but the author was a disciple—that it was composed and arranged by one of the later Christians who was a hearer of John's, and perhaps a disciple of the Gnostic philosophy.[1]

---

[4] *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch: Apostelgeschichte*, 1848, 3te Aufl., Preface v, vi.

[5] *Kommentar*, Römer, 1865, 4te Aufl. p. vii. Cf. Eng. ed. of 1873' Preface by Dr. Dickson, pp. viii and xii; and Lecture VI. pp. 319 sqq.

Eckermann, 1754–1837.

Ammon, 1766–1850.

Paulus, 1761–1851.

Dr. Christian Hermann Weisse, who was a professor of philosophy at Leipzig, gave this line of criticism a more prominent position. He was a jurist and a disciple of Hegel, and at first a friend of Strauss, who speaks, however, of these works as showing the mixture of sound criticism and dilettante idiosyncrasies which characterized the whole standpoint of Weisse.[2] The discourses of Jesus and

Weisse, 1801–1866.

---

[6] *Theologische Beiträge*, 1796, *Ueber die sichern Gründe des Glaubens*, Bd. v. st. 2, p. 147. Cf. Rettig, *Ephemerides exegetico-theologicæ*, 1824, fasc. ii. pp. 57 and 95. Cf. Lücke, *Commentar*, 1840, p. 91.

[7] *Erklärung aller dunkeln Stellen des Neuen Testaments*, 1807, vol. ii.

[8] 'Docetur, Johannem Evangelii auctorem ab editore hujus libri diversum.' Cf. Lücke, *Commentar*, 1840, Th. i. p. 97.

[9] Review of Bretschneider's *Probabilia* in *Heidelberger Jahrbücher der Literatur*, 1821, pp. 112-142, and of Lücke's *Commentar*, *ibid.* pp. 227–261.

[1] 'Compositum esse et digestum a seniori Christiano, Joannis auditori, forsitan gnosticæ dedito philosophiæ.' Cf. Rettig, *ut supra*, Fasc. ii. pp. 83 sq.

[2] *Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk*, 1864, p. 36; cf. Hase, *Geschichte Jesu*, 1876, pp. 129 sq.

of John Baptist are studies from the Apostle's hand, but they were written down simply for the purpose of recording the doctrine. It was after the writer's death that the disciples combined these studies with connecting historical matter and oral teaching into the present Gospel. It is therefore inferior to the Synoptists, and especially to Mark, as a source of history.[3]

Schenkel, 1813–1885.

Dr. Daniel Schenkel,[4] Professor of Theology at Basel and Heidelberg, carried out to further developments the main ideas of Weisse. There are two chief collections of speeches, the one extending to the end of the 12th chapter, the other from the 13th to the end of the 17th chapter. These are Johannine. The history, and many details in the middle of the speech-sections, belong to a later hand. Schenkel afterwards so far agreed with the Tübingen school that he regarded the Gospel as altogether an ideal composition, but he thought it should be derived from Asia Minor about A.D. 110–120, and that it is thus indirectly connected with the Apostle and Ephesus.[5] Later still he gave up all connexion between the Gospel and the Apostle, and abandoned the residence of John in Asia Minor;[6] and in his latest work, *The Christ of the Apostles*,[7] he placed the Gospel in the middle of the second century, and derived it from Asia Minor or Alexandria.

---

[3] *Evangelische Geschichte*, 1838; *Die Evangelienfrage*, 1856.

[4] *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1840, pp. 762, 771; review of Neander, Weisse, and Strauss. *Charakterbild Jesu*, 1864, pp. 23 sq.; ed. 4, 1873, pp. 25 sq.; *Christusbild der Apostel, und der nachapostolischen Zeit*, 1879, pp. 188 sqq.

[5] *Charakterbild*, ed. 1, *loc. cit.*

[6] *Ibid.* ed. 4, *loc. cit.*

[7] *Christusbild, loc. cit.*

Schweizer, 1808–

Dr. Alexander Schweizer,[8] Professor of Theology at Zürich, in his *Gospel of John*, which was published in 1841, a work of high tone and great acuteness, endeavoured to show that the events which have Galilee as their scene are in their present form by a later hand.[9] The Johannine ministry of Jesus was limited to Judæa, but this portion is of true historical character, and the discourses are authoritative. The additions were later than John's death, but before the Gospel was first published.[1] This view was in part adopted and developed by Krüger-Velthusen,[2] but had been meantime abandoned by the author.[3]

Tobler.

Herr Johann Rudolf Tobler, a Zürich pastor, who some thirty years ago attracted much attention by his works on the Fourth Gospel, thought some portions of the Gospel came from the Apostle himself in Aramaic, but that these amount to less than one-tenth of the whole. Special features, and chronological and geographical notices, mark an original witness, who was the Apostle John; but these portions were added to and worked up by Apollos, the author also of the Epistle to the Hebrews, who thus produced a spiritual Gospel which was opposed to Judaism and in favour of Hellenism. The place is Ephesus, and the time the first century.[4]

---

[8] *Das Evangelium Johannes nach seinem innern Werthe und seiner Bedeutung für das Leben Jesu kritisch untersucht*, Leipzig, 1841.

[9] John, capp. ii. 1–12, iv. 44–54, vi. 1–26, and also cap. xxi., and some smaller insertions, capp. i. 21 sq., xvi. 30, xviii. 9, xix. 35–37.

[1] *Das Evangelium Johannes, ut supra*, p. 276.

[2] *Leben Jesu*, 1872.

[3] *Protestantische Kirchenzeitung*, 1864, pp. 362 sqq.

Ewald, 1803–1875.

Dr. Heinrich Ewald,[5] the very apostle of untrammelled thought, received in 1838, after his expulsion from Göttingen, a call to Tübingen, where he was professor for ten years; but no man was a more determined opponent of Baur and the Tübingen school. He held with characteristic freedom and characteristic strength his own views of the historic value of the discourses and the narratives of the miracles in the Fourth Gospel; but this does not weaken the force of his position as to the authorship. The Apostle somewhere about the year A.D. 80 composed his Gospel, availing himself of the help of trusted friends, who ten years later, but still before the Apostle's death, added the twenty-first chapter. Here [6] another hand appears more freely than in the Gospel itself, though it was not wholly absent even there.[7] Ewald's definite views as to the authenticity have been made familiar to English students by Oxford and Cambridge teachers, to whom I have already made reference. This is a quotation from an article by Ewald which Canon Liddon makes with approval :—

---

[4] *Die Evangelienfrage im allgemeinen u. die Johannesfrage insbesondere*, 1858; *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1860, pp. 169 sqq.; *Evangelium Johannis nach dem Grundtext*, 1867; *Grundzüge der evangelischen Geschichte*, 1870.

[5] *Jahrbücher der biblischen Wissenschaft*, Göttingen, 1851, pp. 150 sq.; 1853, pp. 32 sq.; 1860, pp. 83 sq.; 1865, pp. 212 sq.; *Die Johanneischen Schriften*, 1861, i. pp. 1–59; *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 1868, vii. pp. 237 sq.

[6] John, cap. xxi. 24, 25.

[7] *Ibid.* cap. xix. 35.

> Those who since the first discussion of this question have been really conversant with it, never could have had and never have had a moment's doubt. As the attack on St. John has become fiercer and fiercer, the truth during the last ten or twelve years has been more and more solidly established, error has been pursued into its last hiding-places, and at this moment the facts before us are such that no man who does not will knowingly to choose error and to reject truth, can dare to say that the fourth Gospel is not the work of the Apostle John.[8]

These are words which Bishop Westcott quotes with the comment, 'For the rest Ewald's calm and decisive words are, I believe, simply true' :—

> That John is really the author of the Gospel, and that no other planned and completed it than he who at all times is named as its author, cannot be doubted or denied, however often in our times critics have been pleased to doubt and deny it on grounds which are wholly foreign to the subject: on the contrary every argument, from every quarter to which we can look, every trace and record, combine together to render any serious doubt upon the question absolutely impossible.[9]

Hase, 1800–1889.

Professor Karl von Hase,[1] whose death is one of the many which critical science has mourned over during the last few months, had been known to successive generations for more than half a century, not only as a first authority on the history and dogma of the Church, but as a defender of the Fourth Gospel in the method of Schleiermacher, differing from his master chiefly in that he ascribed the Apocalypse also to the Apostle.[2] But in the *History of Jesus*, which was published in 1876, he advances the opinion of his old age, that the Gospel is not the immediate work of the Apostle. In Asia Minor, and especially in Ephesus, there had been formed through the narrations of John, who was one of the last and most revered of the eye-witnesses of the life of Jesus, a Gospel-tradition which was quite distinct from the Galilæan. After the death of John, perhaps a decade or more, this Johannine tradition was written down by a gifted disciple of the Apostle. The disciple has lived in the thoughts of his illustrious master, and has written only as the master himself would have written. Thus arose a 'Gospel according to John,' which in the next generation became a 'Gospel of John.' And yet Hase was, like Strauss,[3] doubtful of his doubts. He had for many years fought against them, and was to the end least of all in agreement with those who are confident in setting aside this Gospel. He confessed with a sad heart that he could not be sure of the full Johannine authorship, though he had expressed this in the last edition of his *Manual*, and he feels that opinion may change again.[4]

---

[8] *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*, Aug. 1863, review of Renan; Gratry, *Jésus-Christ*, p. 119; Liddon, *Bampton Lectures*, 1866, ed. 13, 1889, p. 220.

[9] Westcott, *Introduction to the Gospels*, ed. 3, p. x.

[1] *Geschichte Jesu*, 1876, *i.e.* an enlargement of the *Leben Jesu*, edd. 1–5, 1829–65; *Die Tübinger Schule—Sendschreiben an Baur*, 1855.

---

[2] Cf. Strauss, *Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk*, pp. 23 sq.

[3] Cf. Lecture IV. p. 198.

[4] *Geschichte Jesu, ut supra*, p. 52, cf. pp. 611, 612, *Kirchengeschichte*, 1885, i. pp. 183 sq.; and *Kirchengeschichte. Lehrbuch*, 1886, pp. 37 sq.

Reuss,

Dr. Reuss, until recently professor at Strasburg, who writes now in French and now in German, but who since the annexation of Alsace has become a German citizen, has been for half a century prominently known as an independent member of the liberal party of the Lutheran church. His works[5] which relate to the present subject are everywhere marked by great ability, and by a striking combination of reverence and freedom. In the earlier works he accepts the Johannine authorship, but thinks that the speeches are to be largely traced, not with Baur to metaphysical conceptions, but to religious mysticism. In the later editions of his well-known *History of the Canon* in 1874 and 1887, he admits the 'double element,' and in the *Johannine Theology*[6] published in 1879 he no longer holds in the full sense the direct Johannine authorship. The author, in his opinion, distinguishes himself from S. John in more than one passage, but derives his materials immediately from him. In Dr. Reuss's own striking words :—

> If we are authorized by the form of the Fourth Gospel to see in it more than a simple biography, this first impression is amply confirmed by the contents and substance of the book. It is in reality a theological *treatise*, as much as the Epistle to

---

[5] *Ideen zur Einleitung in das Evangelium Johannes—Denkschrift der theologischen Gesellschaft zu Strasburg*, 1840 ; *Die Geschichte der heiligen Schriften, Neues Testament*, ed. 1, 1842 ; ed. 2, 1853 ; ed. 5, 1874, Eng. Trans. 1884 ; ed. 6, 1887 ; *Histoire de la théologie chrétienne au siècle apostolique*, 1852 ; Eng. Trans. 1872 ; *Théologie Johannique* in *La Bible, Nouveau Testament*, vi^{e} partie, 1879.

[6] *Théologie Johannique, ut supra*, pp. 40 sq.

the Hebrews, and more so than any of S. Paul's Epistles. It is an exposition of the Christian faith inasmuch as the person of Christ is its centre. It is diminishing its intention to say that it is a pragmatic history of the struggle between the Jews and their unrecognized and rejected Saviour; it is, on the contrary, a picture of the world's opposition (in all ages) to the Light which comes from God, full of grace and truth. This does not imply that this theology has no historic basis. On the contrary, the Johannine Gospel is a striking proof that all Christian theology is raised on such a basis, and that in this it is distinguished from a purely philosophic theology. But we affirm that the author had no intention of teaching his hearers history; he knows it, or supposes it to be known, and undertakes to interpret it, to reveal its inmost meaning, to show that here are other things besides popular teaching, or miracles that appeal to the imagination, or tragic complications, such as are met with throughout the annals of humanity.[7] The Fourth Gospel has come to us without the author's name, like most of the other elements of which the sacred volume is composed. Criticism has shown itself powerless, either to raise traditional opinion above all serious and legitimate doubt, or to relegate this document to an inferior position and assimilate it to the literary productions of a second generation which had lost to some extent the creative genius of their predecessors. We consider that this is a providential warning for religious science. Ideas are more essential than proper names, and the value of the former is independent of the certainty of the latter.[8]

It is significant that the sixth edition of the *History of the Canon* no longer treats of the Fourth Gospel immediately after the Synoptics, but deals with it after the Epistle of Clement. But the external evidence for the Johannine authorship may still, he thinks, be possibly convincing: and the strongest objection is the yet weightier evidence for the Apocalypse, which cannot be by the same writer as the Gospel.[9]

---

[7] *Théologie Johannique*, 1879, p. 12.

[8] *Ibid.* p. 108.

Renan, 1823–

M. Renan draws[1] a sharp distinction between the authentic and the unauthentic portions of the Gospel, but his principle of division is exactly opposed to that of those who preceded him. It is not the historical setting, but the discourses, which are now questioned. The history, indeed, is to be preferred to that of the Synoptists, but the discourses are 'tirades prétentieuses, lourdes, mal écrites,' and it is not by these that Jesus founded his divine work.[2] In the preface to the thirteenth edition, Renan gives a summary of the views which were held as to the Fourth Gospel. His own view in the first edition is:—

> The Fourth Gospel is in the main the work of the Apostle John, but it has perhaps been edited and retouched by his disciples. The facts which are related in this Gospel are direct records of Jesus, but the discourses are often free compositions, which express only the author's conception of the mind of Jesus.

His view in the thirteenth edition and afterwards is:—

> The Fourth Gospel is not the work of the Apostle John. It was attributed to him by one of his disciples about the year 100. The discourses are almost wholly fictitious; but

---

[9] *Geschichte, ut supra*, ed. 6, 1887, p. 249.

[1] *Vie de Jésus*, 1863; ed. 17, 1882.

[2] Ed. 1, p. xxx.

the narrative portions contain valuable traditions, which go back in part to the Apostle John.

After referring to the opinion which places the Gospel well on in the second century, he adds :—

> I cannot go wholly with this radical party. I hold always to the belief that the Fourth Gospel has a real connection with the Apostle John, and that it was written towards the end of the first century.[3]

Sabatier, 1839–

Dr. Sabatier, Professor of Theology in the Protestant Faculty of the University of Paris, is the author of an essay on the *Sources of the Life of Jesus*,[4] which is largely devoted to the Fourth Gospel and intended to support the Johannine authorship. But in a later article, in Lichtenberger's Encyclopædia, Dr. Sabatier gives up the immediate authorship, and thinks the writer to be one of John's disciples who has edited the Gospel history after the form known in Asia Minor. The Apocalypse was the work of the author himself: the Gospel is a spiritualized apocalypse written by a disciple. Dr. Sabatier remains convinced that the roots of the thought of the Fourth Gospel are to be found in the Apocalypse and in the Jewish-Christian theology generally, not in Paulinism. The development from the teaching of Jesus to the theology of John is natural and without a break, and it is this which explains its incomparable serenity.[5]

---

[3] *Ut supra*, ed. 13, pp. x, xi; cf. ed. 17, 1882, pp. lviii sq., 477 sq.

[4] *Essai sur les sources de la vie de Jésus, les trois premiers Evangiles et le quatrième*, 1866.

[5] *Encyclopédie des Sciences religieuses*, 1880, vii. pp. 181–193.

Professor Karl von Weizsäcker, who became Baur's successor in the professorial chair at Tübingen in 1861, published in 1864, after several essays in the *Year-Book for German Theology* of which he was editor,[6] his remarkable *Investigations of the Gospel History.*[7] John is, he thinks, the indirect, a trusted disciple of the Apostle is the direct, author; or it might have been composed by disciples after the Apostle's oral teaching or notes. The whole Gospel has a double character. At every point it is an historical report of the sayings and deeds of Christ; but it is also an ideal composition, and every detail of the representation has a double sense. In his latest work on the *Apostolic Age*, published in 1886, and republished in the present year,[8] Dr. Weizsäcker takes the age of the Apostles, properly so-called, to end at the year A.D. 70. The following thirty years are the Johannine period. There was a Johannine school in Ephesus. The two principal works which bear the name of John probably came from the school of the Apostle, but neither is the work of John, who remained a Jew and formed a Jewish-Christian church.[9] At the time the Gospel was written the Apostle was dead, but his death had not long taken place.[1]

Weizsäcker, 1822–

Dr. Wendt, the Heidelberg professor, has in part

Wendt, 1853–

---

[6] *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, 1857, pp. 154 sqq.; 1859, pp. 685 sqq.; 1862, pp. 619 sqq.

[7] *Untersuchungen über die evangelische Geschichte*, 1864, 1. Theil, iii. pp. 220–302.

[8] *Das Apostolische Zeitalter*, 1886. Cf. the valuable criticism by Loofs in *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1887, No. 3, pp. 51–61; ed. 2, 1890.

[9] *Ibid.* ed. 2, pp. 504 sq.

[1] *Ibid.* p. 536.

renewed and has also carried to fresh issues the theories of Weisse and Schenkel. He thinks, in his *Doctrine of Jesus*,[2] that there is a genuine historical document issuing from John which corresponds to the *Logia* used by Matthew. In the original *Logia* these discourses are confined to the last days of Jesus, but are by the editor made to extend over the whole ministry. Use is also made of sources of Pauline thought, and of the Acts of the Apostles. He finds traces of Hebrew origin in the part which has the primary historical document for a basis, and thinks that the writer was an Ephesian disciple of John.[3]

These writers, while they differ much from each other, agree in the opinion that the Gospel is in part, if not in whole, directly or indirectly, to be traced to the Apostle John.

The negative school:

A number of other writers who are lineal descendants of the Tübingen school, and are characterized by a similar boldness and a similar freedom, but are not strictly bound by either the principles or the results of their predecessors, may be conveniently grouped together and spoken of as 'the present negative school.' The school will naturally have three chief divisions, the German, the Dutch, the English. It will be sufficient to notice the following:—

German

Dr. Theodor Keim, to whom reference has already been made in this course of lectures,[4] and whose too early death, in 1878, left a gap which has not yet been filled, held that the Gospel has an historical purpose, but that the writer is no eye-witness or setter forth of objective facts. He is everywhere under the control of the subjective idea. Before he comes to the history of Jesus, he gives a philosophic view of the universe, which is that of Philo. Dr. Keim thinks that when a historian begins with philosophy, he will adapt that which actually happened to suit his point of view.[5] The writer of the Fourth Gospel, in his opinion, finds the *Logos* before the creation of the world and traces it through all preceding history, and describes the life of Jesus in accordance with this idea and from this exalted standpoint. Unlike Luke, he declines to give a full history of Jesus,[6] and gives such a selection of details as will maintain the judgment of faith as to the person of Jesus, in opposition to Gnostic unbelief. The date is the time of Trajan, A.D. 100–117.[7] In a later recasting of Dr. Keim's work, which was of a more popular character, the date is placed at about

---

[2] *Die Lehre Jesu*, 1886, i. pp. 215 sq.

[3] Cf. review by Holtzmann in *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1886, No. 9, pp. 197–200.

Keim, 1825–1878.

---

[4] Cf. Lecture I. p. 3.

[5] *Geschichte Jesu von Nazara*, 1867–71, i. pp. 103–172; *Dritte Bearbeitung*, 2te Aufl. 1875, pp. 38 sq., 377 sq.; cf. Hausrath, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, 1873, iii. pp. 565–625; 1877, iv. pp. 376 sqq.

[6] John, cap. xx. 30.

[7] 'Die äusseren Zeichen ergeben: das 4. Evangelium ist in den Anfängen des 2. Jahrhunderts ohne Zweifel unter Kaiser Trajan zwischen 100–117 nach Chr. entstanden, immerhin so spät nach den Synoptikern und nach dem Fürsten der Synoptiker, dass es alle Mühe hatte, neben ihrer in den Gemeinden immer schon befestigten Auctorität sich seine Bahn zu brechen.' Keim, *Geschichte Jesu von Nazara*, 1867, Bd. i. p. 146.

A.D. 130.[8] The author is a Christian of Jewish origin, belonging to the Dispersion of Asia Minor.

H. Holtzmann, 1832–

Dr. Heinrich Holtzmann, now professor in Strasburg, a prolific author, whose recent *Introduction to the New Testament* has placed him in the first rank of writers on this subject, holds that the Gospel is an ideal composition based upon Synoptic material, of about the same period as the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Epistle of Barnabas, and that it was generally admitted into the Church after about A.D. 150. The Logos Gospel is not so much a history of the life of Jesus as a picture of His inmost being. It is no more pure fiction than the assertion in S. Matthew :—

> All things are delivered unto me of my Father : and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father : neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him ;[9]

and the solution of the problem is to be found in the balance of the ideal and historical elements. He holds that the Gospel was in the hands of Justin, A.D. 150, but that in Barnabas and Clement, A.D. 93–125, we are only in a Johannine nebula. The star of the Gospel had not yet risen.[1]

---

[8] 'Das Evangelium ist also wahrscheinlich erst um's Jahr 130 geschrieben worden ; . . .' Ed. 1875, *ut supra*, p. 40.

[9] Matt. xi. 27.

[1] In Schenkel's *Bibel-Lexikon*, 1869–1871, art. *Evangelium nach Johannes*, ii. pp. 221 sqq., and art. *Johannes der Apostel*, iii. pp. 328 sqq. ; *Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, ed. 2, 1886, pp. 438–488 ; *Die Gnosis und das Johanneische Evangelium*, 1877 : cf. *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1869, pp. 62 sqq., 155 sqq., 446 sqq. ; 1871, pp. 336 sqq. ; 1875, pp. 40 sqq. ; 1877, pp. 187 sqq.

Dr. Wilhelm Hönig is known to us from a series of remarkable articles on the construction of the Fourth Gospel which were published in *Hilgenfeld's Review*.[2] He presents a scheme with two main divisions, the one consisting of the first eleven chapters, and the other of the remainder of the Gospel, each division having an introduction and three parts.[3] The whole work is arranged in accordance with a preconceived plan of threes, and therefore is not historical.[4] Hönig.

Dr. Albrecht Thoma has already occupied our attention by his special investigations into Justin's use of the Fourth Gospel.[5] He is also the author of a work of high order on the origin of the Gospel, in which he regards the Evangelist as a Christian Philo, a child of the Alexandrine Judaism which proceeded from the chief school in Ephesus. He thinks that he is identical with the presbyter of the Second and Third Epistles of John, and somewhat later than the insurrection of Bar-Kochba, A.D. 132 or 133; and that he attempted to form a mosaic of the *Logos-Christus* revelation on the basis of the religious philosophy of Alexandria. He finds materials for his allegorical work in the Synoptic Gospels, the Old Testament, the writings of Philo, the substance of the Acts of the Apostles, the Pauline development of Thoma, 1844–

---

[2] *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1871.

[3] John, cap. i.–xi. and xii.–xxi.

[4] *Zeitschrift, ut supra*, pp. 535 sqq.; 1883, pp. 216 sqq.; 1884, pp. 85 sqq.: cf. Holtzmann, H. J., *ibid.* 1881, pp. 257 sqq.; and *Einleitung, ut supra*, p. 451.

[5] Cf. Lecture II. pp. 73 sq.

doctrine, the Apocalypse. It follows that the work can have no historical value. The Fourth Gospel is only the setting of the *Logos* doctrine in a life of Jesus.[6]

Mangold, 1825–1890.

Dr. Wilhelm Mangold, professor at Bonn, and editor of the later editions of Bleek's *Introduction*,[7] appends to the more conservative pages of his author, a series of footnotes characterized by remarkable ability and fairness, but in the spirit of, and sometimes with the results of, the more negative criticism. His view of the Fourth Gospel is that the external evidence is scarcely less strong than that of the Synoptic Gospels, and would be sufficient to certify it, if the internal grounds for accepting the authenticity did not oppose, as it at least up to the present appears, insuperable difficulties.[8]

Oscar Holtzmann.

Herr Oscar Holtzmann is a younger brother of the Strasburg professor, to whom we have just referred, but his work on the *Gospel of John*[9] is the result of independent and careful research; and, while less pretentious than many, it is perhaps not less valuable than any work of this school. The Fourth Gospel is for him a Christian book of devotion, rather than an artistic presentation of a philosophy of religion, and he here avowedly sides with

---

[6] *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1877, pp. 289 sqq.; 1879, pp. 18 sqq., 171 sqq., 273 sqq.; *Die Genesis des Johannes-Evangeliums*, 1882.

[7] *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, ed. 4, 1886. Cf. Lecture VI. p. 314.

[8] *Einleitung, ut supra*, p. 388, note.

[9] *Das Johannesevangelium untersucht und erklärt*, 1887.

Luthardt, and not with Thoma.[1] The Gospel is, he thinks, grafted on the post-Pauline literature which was influenced by Alexandrine Judaism. The teaching of Paul and that of Philo are elements in its composition. The author is a Jewish Christian living between A.D. 70 and 135, and his dependence upon the Luke Gospel makes it probable that he did not write before A.D. 100.[2] It is hardly possible to assign a more exact date than the first quarter of the second century.[3]

It is especially worthy of notice that Holtzmann follows Thoma and Keim in holding that the author was a Jew by birth,[4] and still more important that so weighty an authority as Schürer, writing in July 1887,[5] thinks this opinion to be in the highest degree probable.

Dutch:

The modern Dutch school, which has of late years taken a prominent place in advanced criticism and subjective theories, and is duly heralded by a special *Theological Journal*,[6] may for the present purpose be represented by Scholten, the late Emeritus Professor of Leyden, though, as Dr. Salmon remarks,

Scholten, 1811–1885.

> it became as hard for a young professor, anxious to gain a reputation for ingenuity, to make a new assault on a New Testament book, as it is now for an Alpine club man to find

---

[1] *Das Johannesevangelium, u.s.w.*, p. 4.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 79.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 173.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 74.

[5] Cf. Schürer's review in *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1887, No. 14, p. 331.

[6] *Theologisch Tijdschrift.*

in Switzerland a virgin peak to climb. The consequence has been that in Holland, Scholten and others, who had been counted as leaders in the school of destructive criticism, have been obliged to come out in the character of conservatives, striving to prove, in opposition to Loman, that there really did live such a person as Jesus of Nazareth, and that it is not true that every one of the epistles ascribed to Paul is a forgery.[7]

Scholten's chief treatise is *The Gospel according to John*,[8] published in 1864, in which he asks :—

> Is the fourth Evangelist John the son of Zebedee? . . . . the writer of the Apocalypse? . . . . a Palestinian Jew? . . . . a Jew?[9]

And to each question he gives a negative answer. His view of the Fourth Gospel is that it is an ideal conception of the evangelical history. It is the highest form of the revelation of Christianity, and has attained this height by assuming the elements of truth which it found in Gnosticism, and in the doctrines of Marcion and Montanus. It thus freed Christianity from the authority of the Old Testament, and from Jewish-Christian and Petrine elements. Such passages as—

---

[7] *Introduction*, ed. 2, p. 379. Cf. Holtzmann, H. J., *Einleitung*, ed. 2, pp. 192–3.

[8] *Historisch-kritische Inleidung in de Schriften des Nieuwe Testaments*, 1853, ed. 2, and in German, 1856; *Schrifter van den Apostel Johannes in Bijbelsch woordenboek*, Amsterdam, 1855—he here takes the Gospel to be Johannine; *Het Evangelie naar Johannes*, 1864–66—German by Lang, 1867—French by Réville, in *Revue de Théologie*, Strasburg, 1864–66; *De oudste getuigenissen*, and in German, *Die ältesten Zeugnisse*, by Manchot, 1867; *Het Apostel Johannes in Klein-Asië*, 1871—and in German, by Spiegel, 1872.

[9] 'Is de vierde evangelist Johannes, de zoon van Zebedeüs? . . . . de schrijver der Apocalypse? . . . . een palestijnsche Jood? . . . . een Jood?'—*Het Evangelie naar Johannes*, *ut supra*, part v. pp. 399–440.

> Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, And shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation.
>
> And this is the will of him that sent me, that everyone which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day.
>
> No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day.
>
> He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day.[1]

are insertions, perhaps by the hand which wrote the twenty-first chapter, The Logos become flesh is king in a realm of truth, and the Paraclete is the principle of truth. Baur, in his opinion, is wrong in thinking that the author wished to support the Eastern view of the Paschal question; he established the Pauline spiritualism which would abolish all feasts. The author is a philosophically trained Gentile-Christian, and the date is about 150. In Scholten's later work, *The Oldest Witnesses*,[2] he can find no trace of the Gospel before 170, and in discussing the residence in Asia Minor he came to the conclusion that John was never in Asia Minor and was not the author of the Apocalypse.[3]

---

[1] John v. 28, 29; vi. 40, 44; xii. 48.

[2] *Die ältesten Zeugnisse*, p. 180.

English:

The modern negative school has had few advocates of any prominence among English writers upon the Fourth Gospel—they have for the most part contented themselves by speaking of the work as already accomplished on the Continent; but the following demand notice at our hands :—

Tayler, 1797–1869.

Mr. J. J. Tayler, formerly Principal of Manchester New College, in an able and thoroughly candid but, as it seems to me, an unconsciously partial criticism, assigns the Gospel to the first half of the second century. The writer's investigations are made at first hand, but he is largely guided by Hilgenfeld, especially on the Paschal question,[4] to which he devotes no small part of his inquiry. It cannot but be regretted that it has been impossible to have the judgment of so real a scholar and thinker, since the new lights which have been shed upon the criticism of the Fourth Gospel during the last twenty years. The opinion which Mr. Tayler formed was that the Gospel is not the work of the Apostle, and was probably written by John the Presbyter. He has little doubt that the author of the Gospel and the First Epistle were one and the same person. The

---

[3] Cf. Hilgenfeld in opposition to this: *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1872, pp. 349–383, and Scholten's reply in *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 1872, pp. 325–330, and in Appendix to German edition of the *Zeugnisse*.

[4] Cf. Lecture VIII. p. 424.

Gospel and the Apocalypse cannot be by the same author.[5] Mr. Tayler

> found how impossible it was, in every case but that of Paul, to establish satisfactory evidence of direct personal authorship: and came at length to the full persuasion, that the one point of importance to ascertain respecting any particular book, was simply this;—that, whoever might have written it, it belonged to the first age, while the primitive inspiration was still clear and strong,—and that it could be regarded as a genuine expression of the faith and feeling which then prevailed.[6]

Supernatural Religion.

The work entitled *Supernatural Religion*[7] was published anonymously, and the name of the author has never been authoritatively declared. The book created for the moment a great sensation, and six editions were issued in a little more than twelve months.[8] This treatise is not primarily a critical discussion on the Fourth Gospel. It is, like the work of Strauss, occupied with other matters, and a writer who undertakes an inquiry about the Fourth Gospel, after he has placed before his readers a lengthy negative criticism on miracles and the supernatural, can hardly be said to approach the historical investigation with an open mind. The expectation will be raised—and it is not disappointed—that the author has adopted the extremer opinions of some continental writers, and that he thinks the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel to be on all grounds wholly unworthy of credit. For the sake of comparison with some writers of the same school, the following statements may be noted :—

---

[5] *An Attempt to ascertain the Character of the Fourth Gospel, especially in its Relation to the Three First*, London, 1867; ed. 2, by J.[ames] M.[artineau], 1870; *The Theological Review*, vol. v. pp. 373–401, July 1868, review of Davidson's *Introduction*: cf. *infra*, pp. 272 and 285.

[6] Preface, *ut supra*, 1867, p. vii.

[7] Ed. 1, 2 vols. 1874; ed. 7, 'complete edition, carefully revised,' 1879.

[8] Preface, recently republished, in a reply to Dr. Lightfoot's essays, to ed. 6, March 15, 1873. This preface contains a reply to criticisms on the work. The contents of the original edition are arranged as follows:—Part I. Miracles, vol. i. pp. 1–216; Part II. The Synoptic Gospels, vol. i. pp. 217–490; vol. ii. pp. 1–250; Part III. The Fourth Gospel, vol. ii. pp. 251–492.

> The external evidence that the Apostle John wrote the Apocalypse is more ancient than that for the authorship of any book of the New Testament, excepting some of the Epistles of Paul.[9]
>
> Whilst a strong family likeness exists between the Epistles and the Gospel, and they exhibit close analogies both in thought and language, the Apocalypse, on the contrary, is so different from them in language, in style, in religious views and terminology, that it is impossible to believe that the writer of the one could be the author of the other.[1]

Opinions of this work by

The publication of this work naturally attracted the attention of scholars; and the criticism of Bishops Lightfoot and Westcott, of Drs. Sanday and Ezra Abbot produced permanent additions to theological literature.[2] Further criticism is not now needed, but the general character of the book may be briefly indicated by two or three examples. The following notes will serve to show Dr. Zahn's view as to the author's treatment of the Ignatian question :— Zahn,

---

[9] *Supernatural Religion*, ed. 1, part iii. vol. ii. p. 392.

[1] *Ibid.* p. 388.

[2] Cf. Lecture VI. pp. 336 and 343 sqq.

> What I have already said against the author of the book *Supernatural Religion*, who mixes up different recensions and reiterates the most trifling arguments of others, must suffice.[3]
>
> Volkmar had a follower in the writer of the book *Supernatural Religion*, more audacious even than himself.[4]

Similarly as to Polycarp :—

> The author of the book *Supernatural Religion* also, doubting whether he should say that the whole was supposititious or that it was interpolated, repeated the arguments of Dallaeus which had been refuted a thousand times. Lightfoot answered him splendidly, and in every way argued with great ability on the integrity and authenticity of the Epistle.[5]

Ten years after its publication, when the controversy had ceased and the book was well-nigh forgotten, this was Dr. Salmon's judgment upon it :— Salmon.

> The extreme captiousness of its criticism found no approval from respectable foreign reviewers, however little they might be entitled to be classed as believers in Revelation. Dates were assigned in it to some of our New Testament books so late as to shock anyone who makes an attempt fairly to judge

---

[3] 'Contra auctorem libri *Supernatural Religion* i. 264 sq., recensiones diversas confundentem et aliorum levissima argumenta iterantem sufficiunt, quae dixi Ign. 117 sq.' *Patr. Ap. Opp.* fasc. ii. 1876, p. vi.

[4] 'Sectatorem ipso auctore [Volkmaro] audaciorem habuit scriptorem libri *Supernatural Religion*, i. 268.'—*Ibid.* p. xii.

[5] 'Etiam auctor libri *Supernatural Religion*, i. 274–278, ed. 2, haesitans, utrum totam suppositiciam, an interpolatam diceret, argumenta Dallaei sexcenties refutata repetivit. Egregie illi respondit et omnino de integritate atque authentia epistulae optime disputavit Lightfootius (*Contemp. Review*, 1875, May, p. 838–852).' *Ibid.* p. xlv.

of evidence. And the reason is, that the author starts with the denial of the supernatural as his fixed principle. . . . This book . . . . obtained a good deal of notoriety by dint of enormous puffing, great pains having been taken to produce a belief that Bishop Thirlwall was the author. The aspect of the pages, bristling with learned references, strengthened the impression that the author must be a scholar of immense reading. The windbag collapsed when Lightfoot showed that this supposed Bishop Thirlwall did not possess even a schoolboy acquaintance with Greek and Latin, and that his references were in some cases borrowed wholesale, in others did not prove the things for which they were cited, and very often appealed to writers whose opinion is of no value. But what I wish here to remark is, that what really made the book worthless was not its want of scholarship, but its want of candour. . . . want of candour vitiates a book through and through. There is no profit in examining the conclusions arrived at by a writer who never seems to care on which side lies the balance of historic probability, but only which conclusion will be most disagreeable to the assertors of the supernatural. For myself, I find instruction in studying the results arrived at by an inquirer who strives to be candid, whether he be orthodox or not; but I have little curiosity to find out the exact amount of evidence which would leave a captious objector without a word to say in justification of his refusal to admit it.[6]

Abbott, 1838–

Dr. Edwin A. Abbott, late Master of the City of London School, must be classed among those who do not admit S. John's authorship or Justin's use of the Fourth Gospel, but his able and interesting articles are, as might have been expected from a scholar of the writer's position, widely different in tone from the preceding English work. His general conclusion as to the external evidence, based upon a somewhat cursory examination, is

---

[6] *Historical Introduction to the New Testament*, ed. 2, pp. 9, 10.

> that, although some of the *doctrine* of the Fourth Gospel, expressed in words similar to the words of the Fourth Gospel, was probably current in the Ephesian church towards the end of the first half of the second century, yet it was not by that time widely used, if at all, as an authoritative document; nor have we proof that it was so used till the times of Irenæus, *i.e.*, towards the end of the second century, by which time the Gospel was authoritatively quoted as a work of John; and those who so quoted it probably meant by 'John,' John the son of Zebedee, the apostle.[7]

After a fuller examination of the internal evidence the writer comes to this conclusion:—

> It is more easy to arrive at negative than at positive results, when evidence is so slight; but it seems probable that the author, attempting to give the spiritual essence of the gospel of Christ, as a gospel of love, and assigning the Ephesian Gospel to the beloved disciple who had presided over the Ephesian church, by way of honour and respect (for the same reasons which induced the author of the 2nd Epistle of Peter to assign that Epistle to the leading apostle), and being at the same time conscious that the book (though representing the Ephesian doctrine generally, and in part the traditions of John the apostle, as well as those of Andrew, Philip, Aristion, and John the elder) did not represent the exact words and teaching of the disciple—added the words 'We know, &c.,' partly as a kind of *imprimatur* of Andrew, Philip, and the rest; partly in order to imply that other traditions besides those of John are set forth in the book; partly to characterize the book as a Gospel of broader basis and

---

[7] Article *Gospels*, in *Encyclopædia Britannica*, ed. 9, 1879, vol. x. p. 824; *Justin's Use of the Fourth Gospel*, in *Modern Review*, 1882, pp. 559-588; 716-756. Cf. Lecture II. p. 80.

greater authority than the less spiritual traditions issuing from non-apostolic authors, which our evangelist desired to correct or supplement.[8]

Dr. Abbott thinks that 'there is unusually strong evidence to show that John the apostle wrote the Apocalypse;' and regards the First Epistle, with Dr. Lightfoot, 'as a kind of postscript to the Gospel.'[9]

Davidson, 1807–

But the most important representative of the negative school among English writers is Dr. Samuel Davidson, who has occupied for nearly half a century a prominent place among biblical critics. This writer's direct influence on the study of English biblical criticism must have been considerable, and his indirect influence has been probably still greater. It is therefore necessary to our present subject—the negative criticism of our age—to devote to it more space than could be afforded to writers whose eminence might seem to have stronger claims. For this reason the statement of his position has been reserved for the close of the present lecture.

His *Introduction.*

His earlier work, an *Introduction to the New Testament*,[1] published just forty years ago, specially appeals to the suffrages of scholars. Its opening page bears the well-known words of Milton :—

Dedication.

It is to the Learned that I address myself, or if it be thought that the Learned are not the best Umpires and Judges

---

[8] Article *Gospels, ut supra*, p. 841.

[9] *Ibid.* pp. 818, 819.

[1] *An Introduction to the New Testament*, 3 vols. 1848–51.

> of such things, I should at least wish to submit my Opinion to Men of a mature and manly Understanding, possessing a thorough Knowledge of the Doctrines of the Gospel; on whose Judgments I should rely with far more Confidence, than on those of Novices in these Matters.

And the closing paragraph of the preface contains the same thought:—

> If it obtain the approbation of *competent judges*, his time will not have been spent in vain.[2]

The newer criticism.

The author is himself a competent judge of the newer criticism, and refers to it in the following terms:—

> It is the Writer's belief that the books of the New Testament are destined ere long to pass through a severe ordeal. The translations of various Continental works which have recently appeared in England, and the tendency of certain speculations in philosophy, indicate a refined scepticism or a pantheistic spirit which confounds *the objective* and *the subjective*, or *unduly subordinates* the former to the latter. Many are disposed to exalt their *intuitions* too highly, to the detriment of *the historical*, as Kant did his 'Pure Reason.'
>
> These observations will serve to show why the Author has gone with considerable fulness into objections that have been urged in modern times against the New Testament books, and especially against the Gospels. He thinks it highly probable that such objections will appear in one shape or other in this country. Hence he has partially anticipated their currency. . . . Hence the Author has noticed the researches of the Tübingen school of theologians, not from a desire to make known extravagant and startling assertions to an English Public, but because his work would not otherwise have been complete; and because he thinks it not improbable that similar doubts

---

[2] *An Introduction, etc.*, p. x.

may be introduced into England, and may meet with acceptance from certain minds which are predisposed to welcome *the new* and *the destructive* however intrinsically false.[3]

In another place the author tells us that

> He has *intentionally* overlooked no source of information with which he is acquainted, English or foreign; and if he has not everywhere chosen to specify each one, it should be recollected that he had to exercise his own judgment in mentioning *the most important*, and such as are *least known* to general readers.[4]

Once again he reminds us that

> He has prosecuted his studies in the New Testament by day and by night, for several years, in the belief that though the work to which he had committed himself was indeed most difficult, it behoved him, while life and health remained, to do something for the illustration and defence of God's holy word, at a time when scepticism of a peculiar order prevails in the land. He can truly say, that he has tried to be impartial in his inquiries, divesting himself of preconceived notions as far as they might impede research. . . . He must say, however, that he has no sympathy with the avowed advocates of systems, creeds, and parties. . . . He appeals to the honest lovers of truth—to the patient inquirers after God's will in the New Testament—to the anxious and humble student of books claiming to be sacred because of heavenly origin.[5]

The author's position.

The author who set this task before himself, and entered upon it in this spirit of freedom and devotion to truth, had special qualifications for his work. He was in the prime of his manhood.[6] He had been for six years, 1835–1841, Professor of Biblical Criticism at Belfast to the General Synod of Ulster; and for a like period, from 1842, Professor of Biblical Literature and Ecclesiastical History in the Lancashire Independent College at Manchester. The University of Aberdeen had conferred upon him the degree of LL.D. in 1838, and he had already published a series of important works on this and cognate subjects.[7]

---

[3] *Introduction, ut supra*, vol. i. 1848, pp. vi, vii.

[4] *Ibid.* vol. ii., 1849, pp. v, vi.

[5] *Ibid.* vol. iii. 1851, pp. xi, xii.

[6] Forty-one to forty-four: born 1807.

In writing the *Introduction*, the author was, as he himself informs us,

> encouraged by the favourable opinions of scholars in this land, in Germany, and in America, whose names stand in the foremost rank of learning,[8]

and, excepting a somewhat excessive strength of statement from which the writer is seldom free, the favourable opinion was fully earned. The book had no equal in the English language at the time; it has in some respects no equal now.

His view of the Fourth Gospel.

The portion of the work which is devoted to the Fourth Gospel contains 147 closely printed large 8vo pages, which deal with all the chief problems connected with the authorship. The following extracts will sufficiently show the result of the writer's careful inquiry:—

> It is difficult to say what evidence would be satisfactory to some. Much depends on the disposition with which they

---

[7] *Lectures on Biblical Criticism*, 1839; *Sacred Hermeneutics*, 1843; *Gieseler's Compendium of Ecclesiastical History*, translated from the German, 1846–47; *Ecclesiastical Polity of the New Testament*, 1848, Schaff-Herzog, *Encyclopedia*; *Supplement*, p. 49.

[8] *Ut supra*, vol. iii. p. xi.

commence their researches, for they may have a strong feeling against the acceptance of all testimony, except what the circumstances of the case do not warrant. It is natural to seek for express and direct testimonies; but they cannot always be found. In the field of criticism, approximations to historic truth will necessarily constitute the results beyond which an inquirer cannot go. He must combine the materials before him, weigh minute circumstances, and draw conclusions in many cases where *irresistible evidence* is wanting. He must be often contented with *probability* instead of certainty. It is idle to demand *tangible* proof on every occasion.[9]

Again—

When those who date the origin of our Gospel in the second century venture to specify the precise time or nearly so at which it appeared, it is easy to demonstrate the impossibility of its immediate and general reception as a sacred book by the catholic church. On their hypothesis it started, as if by a miracle, into common use and authority. There was none to detect or expose the fraud. Men who had been John's disciples, or who had conversed with him or his disciples, did not venture to raise their voice against the supposititious work. All were deceived, or disgracefully silent respecting the imposture. They discarded other apocryphal productions; they would not admit other spurious Gospels, while they unhesitatingly adopted *this*. Whoever can believe the truth of such a representation is far more credulous than the early Christians, whose easy faith forms an object of his contempt.[1]

Again—

Conclusion as to

In bringing our remarks on the authenticity of the fourth Gospel to a close, we cannot refrain from expressing our deep and growing conviction of the historical fidelity by which the sacred document is pervaded. That it bears the impress of its authenticity.

---

[9] *Introduction, ut supra*, vol. i. p. 254.

[1] *Ibid.* vol. i. pp. 270, 271.

the beloved disciple, fresh and vivid from his tender spirit, appears to us unquestionable. And that it *purports to be* from his pen is not less apparent. There are, it is true, difficulties connected with it which may never be satisfactorily resolved, amid our ignorance of the circumstances in which it appeared; but such difficulties belong in part to every ancient book, and are immeasurably increased in the present case, on the supposition of our Gospel having originated in the second century on Hellenistic ground. The man who could exhibit such a portrait of Christ from his own reflection and fancy at that later period, must have been a prodigy to which the century presents nothing approaching to a parallel; for it need not be told how barren that century was in individuals of creative intellect and large heart, like the author of the document in question. And then it must be maintained, not only that he produced a work equally removed from the anthropomorphic, material religiousness, as from the narrow intellectuality of his day, but that he remained in miraculous concealment. The spirit, elevated so far above his countrymen and contemporaries, giving utterance to such aspects of Christ's character as have attracted universal humanity in all future time, continued unknown. Exerting, as he did, immeasurable influence on the consciousness of the Christian church, he was always buried in impenetrable obscurity. And yet he was able to procure universal acceptance for his work as though it really belonged to an apostolic time, and to an eye-witness of the sufferings of Christ. He completely succeeded in his imposture. The few great ideas which he clothed with flesh and blood, commended themselves with astonishing readiness to the mind and heart of the Christian world, undetected in their source, age, and aim. Those who can believe all this, with Baur and his school, have renounced all claim to genuine historical criticism, by abandoning themselves to a reckless caprice, where calmness of investigation and unbiassed love of truth are entirely wanting.[2]

---

[2] *Introduction, ut supra*, vol. i. pp. 311, 312.

Second *Introduction.*

Less than twenty years later Dr. Davidson published his second *Introduction.*[3] He regarded it not as a new edition of the earlier work, but as an essentially new work. He was

> determined to conduct his investigations as though he had never written on the subject.

He claims, and no one will question the claim, that

> twenty years' study may well modify, correct, or enlarge views to which an honest though less perfect investigation had formerly led.[4]

His views are, again,

> not put forward lightly, but after anxious thought.[5]

Change of view

When and under what influences the process of modifying, correcting, and enlarging commenced is not told. In 1848 the conviction of the historical fidelity of the Fourth Gospel is so strong that an expression of it cannot be refrained, and it is still 'growing.'[6] In the preface to the concluding volume of the work,[7] the same general tone is maintained.[8] In 1868 the growing tree of 1851 has been plucked out by the roots, and hardly any mark of its existence left behind, for another tree of sturdy growth has taken its place. The later views have long been in process of formation; but the earlier views seem also to have satisfied the author's convictions, for he himself frankly tells us:—

---

[3] *An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament*, 2 vols., 1868. In the second edition of this work, published in 1882, the matter is rearranged and in part rewritten so as to incorporate the more recent negative criticisms. The standpoint is the same, and there are no material additions. 'Der Standpunkt des Verfassers im Allgemeinen ist aber derselbe geblieben, wie in der Auflage von 1868 . . .' Schürer, *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1882, No. 17, p. 394.

[4] *Ut supra*, 1868, vol. i. pp. vii, viii.

[5] *Ibid.* p. ix.

[6] *Ut supra*, vol. i. 1848, p. 311.

[7] May 15, 1851.

[8] *Ut supra*, vol. iii. 1851, pp. xi, xii.

> Though often requested by correspondents to write another book, he could not think of doing so while his earlier one remained unexhausted.[9]

on the Fourth Gospel.

The new views of the Fourth Gospel cannot be better described than in the words which the author himself applies to the difference between the John of the New Testament and the writer of the Gospel:—

> The development . . . is too great for belief. It is not a development, so much as an entire change of views—an interior metamorphosis which could not have been followed by a serenity perfectly free from traces of the process it succeeded. We can hardly suppose that the mental conflicts of the writer had entirely passed away.[1]

It is not merely that the writer now holds the date to be 'about A.D. 150,' and naïvely confesses,

> Keim's date, A.D. 110–117 under Trajan, makes it exceedingly difficult to disprove Johannine authorship.[2]

It is not that he has modified many of his views and arrived at different results; but at almost every chief point in the discussion the later opinions are the exact opposite of the earlier ones. It is as though a corrector for the press had written 'for *is* read *is not*, for *is not* read *is* passim.' Nor is the reader allowed to see anywhere the process by which the change is arrived at. The discussion of 'The Gospel of John' occupies 146 pages of the new work. Much of it is entirely new, much of the old matter is entirely omitted, and the reader is allowed to wade through these pages without a hint that the author had more fully still established all through the opposite conclusions, and without an attempt to show that the earlier statements are erroneous or the earlier arguments inconclusive.

---

[9] *Introduction, ut supra*, 1868, vol. i. p. vii.

[1] *Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 442.

[2] *Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 426. Keim afterwards put the date at about 130: *supra*, p. 260.

Similar treatment of the Acts.

Nor is this inconsistency of criticism confined to S. John. To examine it at any length would be beyond the limits of the present inquiry, but the discussion of one other book—the Acts of the Apostles, which comes next in order, and the treatment of which is intimately bound up with our present subject—will provide another illustration of the writer's method. In 1868 this is his opinion :—

> These observations lead to the conclusion that the object of the writer was conciliatory. He had two parties in view, Jewish- and Gentile-christian, which he wished to bring nearer to one another. In the interest of that object he moulds the history. A Gentile-christian himself, and regarding Paul as the great apostle, he shows how near he comes to Peter and the other apostles in conduct and sentiments, while fully equal to them in official qualifications. . . . To further Pauline Christianity by bringing the two ecclesiastical parties more closely together, was the author's leading aim.

> This opinion is confirmed by the third gospel, in which the writer was actuated by a like purpose. . . . From the contents of the first chapter compared with the end of the gospel, an interval of several years must be put between the two books, bringing the date of the Acts to about A.D. 125.[3]

So far our author. Now here are Hegel's trinity and Baur's tendency pure and simple. Previous quotations show that the writer had, in 1848–51, already examined and rejected these theories as a whole. The following words will show his view of them as applied to the Acts :—

> In taking leave of this topic, we hesitate not to assert that the idea of the book being fabricated by a later unknown writer, with whatever motive he set about the task, involves the *improbable*, not to say the *impossible*, at every step. The fabricator must have had the Pauline epistles before him, and studied them with the most minute attention. After becoming intimately familiar with their contents, even to the smallest and apparently the most unimportant particulars, he sat down to write in such a way as to incorporate many notices derived from them with his materials. Here he needed consummate skill, lest the deception should be detected. The art demanded for the work was of the most refined and exquisite nature. Where did such a man appear in the early times of Christianity? It is impossible to point to a phenomenon so marvellous as this. The wakefulness and talents of the person who palmed the history on his own generation as the authentic production of Paul's companion, must have been extraordinary. Not so constructed are the forgeries of that period. They are clumsy and inartificial. They have therefore been detected long ago by the test of fair criticism. But the book of Acts has stood this test, unshaken. It was reserved indeed for Hegelianism to expose its alleged preten-

---

[3] *Introduction,* 1868, *ut supra*, vol. ii. pp. 280, 282.

sions: a species of hypercriticism which would soon reduce the genuine histories of all antiquity to nonentities or forgeries. But we are confident that the credibility of the Acts will be universally acknowledged long after the negative criticism has vanished away like every temporary extravagance of unbridled reason, or rather of unbridled scepticism. If there were the least prospect of Baur's opinion regarding the Acts becoming current, we should refer the reader to Kling,[4] who has satisfactorily exposed and refuted the attempt to give the history a *mythic character*, or in other words to reduce it to an *apologetic fiction*.[5]

Criticism on this change,

Now there are more than ordinary reasons for treating the work of Dr. Samuel Davidson with respectful deference. The venerable author is more than fourscore years of age, and is therefore protected from the shafts of criticism. But truth demands from us a reverence more entire even than that which we owe to age; and when a critic of Dr. Davidson's position is put forward as one of the few men among us who is free from prejudice, and whose opinion should therefore command our assent, it is clearly a duty which cannot be rightly avoided, to inquire what is the real value of that opinion.

In the presence of the exaggerated estimate of German works on the New Testament so often made, not by German but by English writers, in depreciation of the works of their countrymen, and the high estimate of Dr. Davidson's work on the ground that it represents the latest result of German scholarship, the following extract from a review of the second edition of his new *Introduction*, by Dr. Emil Schürer, is not unimportant. It will hardly be necessary to state that Dr. Schürer does not write from the point of view of a conservative orthodoxy, or of belief in the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel. The broad platform of the *Literary Journal*, which is edited by Dr. Schürer in connexion with Dr. Harnack, and the high character of its articles, are known to all students :—

---

[4] *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1837, Heft ii. pp. 290–327.

[5] *Ut supra*, vol. ii. 1849, pp. 51, 52.

by Schürer.

> Davidson was a student in Germany, and is well acquainted with German literature. He prizes it highly, almost too highly, even to the point of being unjust towards researches in his own country. For his summary rejection of *all* recent English commentaries on the New Testament (p. vi. *imperfect, however, as are all English commentaries of recent origin*) is not justified in view of Lightfoot's valuable works. With his preference for German literature, he confines himself almost solely to the works of German theologians whom he mentions, and with whose views he deals. If it were not for the garb of a foreign language, one might often fancy that this book was written in Germany. The author has not, however, made very full reference to recent German literature. Among reviews, he chiefly uses Hilgenfeld's *Review of Scientific Theology*, while other contributions to the subject of the New Testament which have lately appeared in German reviews are almost entirely ignored. In other ways his use of recent literature is very limited, although the survey as a whole is brought down to the latest date. This survey of recent literature, however, as well as several modifications in his own views, have necessitated various incidental changes in the present edition.[6]

---

[6] Schürer, *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1882, *ut supra*, No. 17, p. 394.

Both views cannot be right.

Dr. Davidson may have always been, and may now be, and it is not intended in the slightest degree to suggest that he has not been, or is not, a perfectly candid inquirer after truth, but his judgment may have been quite unconsciously warped by circumstances, just as that of other men has been. If the Dr. Davidson of forty years ago, writing with so much preparation and with so many advantages of every kind, and with such a solemn sense of responsibility, was in any degree right in his views of the Fourth Gospel, then the Dr. Davidson of to-day is in the same degree wrong. It is a case of Hume and Mackintosh over again,[7] and we are bound to form our own opinion as to which view is the correct one. It should be based upon a perusal of both works. To my own mind the earlier work has a calm dignity of strength which is absent from the later one ; and for my own part I have little doubt that an entirely impartial mind, trained to examine and estimate evidence, would, if his reading were limited to the works of Dr. Samuel Davidson, decide in favour of the Johannine authorship. And in the case of Dr. Davidson, as in the case of Strauss,[8] much had passed between the two editions of his work. In the year 1857 he resigned the Professorship of Biblical Literature and Ecclesiastical History in the Lancashire Independent College, 'in consequence of an adverse vote of the managing committee, apparently founded upon the view of

His position between the two editions.

---

[7] Cf. Lecture I. pp. 12 sq.

[8] Cf. Lecture IV. p. 108.

inspiration expressed in the second volume of the tenth edition of Horne's *Introduction*,'[9] that is, upon a question of Old Testament criticism which had nothing whatever to do with the authenticity and genuineness of the Fourth Gospel or of any book of the New Testament. Dr. Davidson's position in this controversy, especially in the attack which was made upon his scholarship,[1] was one in which he deserved, and received, the full sympathy of his brother critics of all schools; but it is impossible not to ask what would have been the result if the vote of the majority of the committee of the Lancashire Independent College had been a different one. It is impossible not to regret that Dr. Davidson has not given us more full reasons for his change of view in the almost numberless points in which that view has been changed; and it is impossible not to feel that the claim made by his friends[2]—I know of no occasion on which he has made any such claim for himself—that he is the striking example of absolute freedom from bias, when compared with men whose scholarship and integrity and freedom from bias are certainly as little subject to question as his own, and whose position in criticism has been a well-ordered and consistent whole, is one which cannot be sustained.

---

[9] Schaff-Herzog, *Encyclopedia; Supplement*, p. 49.

[1] See, e.g. *Dr. Davidson, his Heresies, Contradictions, and Plagiarisms*, 1857, by two graduates.

[2] See e.g. *Athenæum*, No. 3232, 5th October 1889, p. 448; *Nineteenth Century*, March 1889, p. 468.

The two latest critics:

Dr. James Martineau, 1805–

The second edition of Mr. Tayler's essay, to which reference has been made in this lecture,[3] was published after his death under the editorial care of his friend and successor Dr. James Martineau; but the work has no important additions from the editor's hand. Dr. Martineau's remarkable position in the regard of this generation of thinkers has been gained on the field of philosophy and ethics, rather than on that of criticism or exegesis; but between the years 1872 and 1875, he published a series of papers in a New England monthly periodical,[4] which included some essays on the Fourth Gospel. The series was not completed, because the periodical itself came to an end, and occupation with the important works which have in the meantime been given to us and have met with most thankful acceptance, has hitherto prevented their author from presenting them in a finished and a permanent form.

His general position.

But during the interval which has occurred in this course of lectures, in consequence of the arrangement of the University terms, Dr. Martineau has published a volume on authority in religion, which is largely a re-working of the earlier papers, and includes some sections on the writings that are commonly ascribed to S. John.[5] The author discloses his position in the preface, which tells us 'that, under such guidance as that of Scholten, Hatch, Pfleiderer, Holtzmann, Harnack, and Weizsäcker,[6] even a veteran student may find it possible, with no very wide reading, to readjust his judgments to the altered conditions of the time.'[7] And of these writers it would seem, if we may judge by results, that Scholten has been chief guide in so far as concerns the writings of S. John. But it will be possible to state Dr. Martineau's conclusions very briefly and in his own words.

---

[3] *Supra*, pp. 266 sq.

[4] *Old and New*, Boston. The papers on the Fourth Gospel were published in the numbers for July and August, 1874, vol. x. pp. 47–58 and 201–222.

The motto of the magazine is suggestive: 'The New does not supplant the Old, but completes it.'—Everett.

[5] Martineau: *The Seat of Authority in Religion*, 1890, pp. 189–243 and 509–12.

His views on the unity of composition.

On the unity of composition he thinks :—

> Whether or not it rightly bears the name of the apostle John, it is, at all events, free from the doubts and complications arising from the process of growth out of prior materials of different dates: it needs no analysis into component elements; it is plainly a whole, the production of a single mind,—a mind imbued with a conception of its subject consistent and complete, and not less distinct for being mystical and of rare spiritual depth.[8]

Author.

On the power of detecting the author by the writing, he says :—

> No such divination is possible; and wherever a critic pretends, by the mere keenness of his unaided eye, to have detected the writer in some unheard-of quarter,—like the Zürich scholar who made out that this very Gospel was certainly the production of Apollos,[9]—we justly look on the

---

[6] But cf. Weizsäcker's view of the Fourth Gospel as stated in this lecture, *supra*, p. 257.

[7] *Seat of Authority*, *ut supra*, Preface, p. vi.

[8] *Op. cit.* p. 189, and Article in *Old and New*, *ut supra*, p. 47.

[9] 'Die Evangelienfrage, Denkschrift, Zürich, 1858.' Cf. *supra*, pp. 249 sq.

pretension as audacious, and its proofs as a waste of ingenuity. We are absolutely dependent, for the first suggestion of an author's name, on the witnesses who speak of it; and any disabilities attaching to these witnesses must seriously affect our reliance on their reports, and throw a greater burden on the internal confirmatory proofs. The primary and substantive evidence is testimonial; which, once given, may gain weight by various congruities, or lose it by incongruities in the writing itself; but which, if not given, can be replaced by neither.[1]

External evidence.

The results of the external testimony are stated as follows :—

Can we, then, sum up the testimony of our witnesses to any definite result? From various quarters the line of their evidence seems to converge upon one time for the origin of this Gospel. [Probably] not known to Justin (about 155), but possibly to the author of the Clementines (about 170); not in the hands of Valentinus (about 160), but in those of his disciples, Ptolemæus and Herakleon (180 and 190); not used by Marcion (about 150), but by Marcionites of the next generation; cited by Apollinaris (about 175); for the first time *named* by Theophilus of Antioch (about 180); the fourth Gospel would seem to have become known in the sixth or seventh decade of the second century, and to have ceased to be anonymous in the eighth. Time must be allowed, prior to these dates, for its gradual distribution from the place of its nativity to the literary centres of the church and of the Gnostic sects. But even the most liberal allowance, which, consistently with the habits of the age and the organization of Christendom, can be claimed for this purpose, will leave us a long way from the apostolic generation. We cannot confidently name any earlier date than the fifth decade of the century. [This conclusion will not be affected, even if we allow Justin to have had the Gospel in his hands.[2]]

---

[1] *Seat of Authority, ut supra*, p. 191; and Article, p. 48.

Internal evidence.

Turning to the internal evidence, Dr. Martineau says :—

[The conclusion seems forced upon us, that the Apostolical authorship of the fourth Gospel receives no adequate support from either claim on its own part, or competent external testimony.[3]]

And, again :—

These several features do not encourage us to look for the fourth evangelist anywhere within the circle of the twelve; and against his identification with John in particular special objections force themselves upon us from his recorded character.[4]

The Apocalypse.

On the relation to the Apocalypse, our author willingly embraces Vischer's theory—that this writing is a Christian overworking of an original Jewish document—which obtained considerable acceptance in 1886 through Harnack's testimony,[5] and concludes that :—

[It cannot therefore have been issued before A.D. 136, and is altogether post-apostolic. . . .

---

[2] *Op. cit.* p. 208; Article, p. 58. The portions in the text marked thus [ ] are not in the Article.

[3] *Op. cit.* p. 211. Not in the Article.

[4] *Op. cit.* pp. 216 sq. 'These several features do not forbid us to look for the fourth evangelist anywhere within the circle of the twelve; and against his identification with John in particular special objections force themselves upon us from the recorded character and extant book of this apostle.' Article, *ut supra*, p. 206.

[5] 'Die Offenbarung Johannis eine Jüdische Apokalypse in Christlicher Bearbeitung; mit einem Nachwort von A. Harnack, 1886.'

What then is the effect of the new discovery (if such it be) respecting the Apocalypse or the question of authorship for the fourth Gospel? Simply this: the Apocalypse is put out of court altogether as a witness in the case. Stripped of its own apostolic pretension, it has nothing to say either for or against that of the Gospel: and the old argument against either from its violent contrast with the other can no longer be pressed.[6]]

The Paschal controversy.

On the Paschal controversy his remarks lead to the statement:—

Here, then, is the whole authority of the Apostle John, his personal habit, and the usage which formed itself under his influence, brought to bear against the historical statement and doctrinal conception of the fourth Gospel. How could this be, if at Smyrna, at Ephesus, and throughout the region where his name was a power, that Gospel had been current as his legacy, and its representation of the last earthly days of Christ had been received as accredited by him? The features of his life and thought which these traditions preserve are precisely what this Gospel resists and banishes.[7]

The 'Marks of Time.'

When he considers the 'Marks of Time,' he thinks:—

Not only is the evangelist other than the apostle [and other than the Ephesian John of the Apocalypse]: he plainly belongs to another age. He uses a dialect, and speaks in tones, to which the first century was strange, and which were never heard till a generation born in the second was in mid-life.[8]

From all quarters, then, does evidence flow in, that the only Gospel which is composed and not merely compiled and edited, and for which, therefore, a single writer is responsible, has its birthday in the middle of the second century, and is not the work of a witness at all.[9]

---

[6] *Seat of Authority*, *ut supra*, p. 227.

[7] *Op. cit.* p. 235; and Article, p. 217.

[8] *Op. cit.* p. 236; Article, p. 217. The portions in [ ] are not in the Article.

The First Epistle.

Later in the work he discusses briefly the relation of the First Epistle to the Gospel, his opinion being :—

[But though long held in suspense by the apparent equipoise of the evidence for and against their identity of origin, I am at last more impressed by a few fundamental differences of religious conception pervading the two writings, than by several agreements in terminology and secondary categories of thought, which point to some common relation to the same school.[1]]

It would be quite unnecessary to criticize the results at which Dr. Martineau has arrived, even if it were consistent with our purpose to do so. They represent the negative standpoint of twenty years ago as seen in Mr. Tayler's work, with the fresh lights of Scholten and others, whose names Dr. Martineau has told us. We do not need to be reminded that these results would be fatal to some of the chief positions[2] of other leaders of the negative criticism which we have already considered ; nor yet that Dr. Martineau's guides are not the only or the most important authorities of the last twenty years upon the subject of the Fourth Gospel. It is a serious defect that this veteran thinker has not allowed other lights also to fall upon his pages.

---

[9] *Op. cit.* p. 242 ; Article, p. 221.

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 509. Not in the Article.

[2] If, for example, the Apocalypse is not the work of S. John, then the whole series of arguments against the authorship of the Gospel on the ground of the differences between these writings would be cancelled.

Dr. Martineau is not, moreover, the only writer on the philosophy of religion who has lately directed his attention to criticism, and has given us the mature results of his studies during this Easter vacation.

Dr. Hugo Delff, 1840–

Dr. Hugo Delff, who had before written several treatises on religious and philosophical subjects, published last year a work on the *History of Jesus of Nazareth*,[3] and has now completed the statement of his views by a special essay on the Fourth Gospel.[4] He has certainly devoted considerable attention to the chief authorities on the subject, which he has studied both in the Hebrew and the Greek sources; and he is not lacking in confidence as to the results. He cannot indeed understand—it is nothing short of ridiculous—that men had not long ago seen that which is so simple and obvious now that he has seen it. The parallel which occurs to him is that of Columbus and the egg.[5] Nor will he have it called a theory: it is nothing short of a historical discovery.[6]

---

[3] *Die Geschichte des Rabbi Jesus von Nazareth.* No date. Pref. Pfingsten, 1889. See esp. pp. 67–207.

[4] *Das vierte Evangelium, ein authentischer Bericht über Jesus von Nazareth wiederhergestellt, übersetzt und erklärt*, 1890. Vorbericht, 'im März.'

[5] 'Wir haben nun also hier aus bester Quelle erfahren, dass unser Verfasser ein Jude aus priesterlichem oder hohepriesterlichem Geschlecht, und nicht der Apostel Johannes war. Das Neue und zwar je einfacher, je näher liegend, also je frappanter es ist, erscheint paradox. Aber man befreie sich nur vom Vorurtheil, zwinge sich, mit Unbefangenheit, mit Objectivität zu sehen und zu lesen, so wird es einleuchtend. Es ist zwar lächerlich, dass man nicht längst das Richtige erkannt

Views of these critics on

Our philosophers are agreed in the fullest assurance that no word of the Fourth Gospel can be rightly assigned to the Apostle John; but here their agreement begins and ends.

eye-witness,

One thinks that '. . . we are thrown upon the remains of popular tradition collected by our synoptists,' . . . which 'cannot pretend to carry the guarantee of known and nameable eye-witnesses.'[7] The other thinks that he has vindicated the Fourth Gospel as the work of an eye-witness and 'the one historical title-deed of Christianity.'[8]

unity,

Dr. Martineau is quite certain that the work is by one writer, whoever he may be.[9] Dr. Delff is not less satisfied that, in addition to the universally recognized interpolations, in which he includes the twenty-first chapter, he can detect a number of smaller ones, and several very considerable sections, which are no part of the original.[1]

---

hat. Aber das Einfachste ist immer das Schwerste, das Nächstliegende das Entfernteste; es geht wie mit dem Ei des Columbus. Auch rührt die mangelnde Einsicht daher, dass bisher fast nur Theologen sich mit diesen Fragen beschäftigt haben, also Solche, die entweder als Verfasser durchaus den Apostel Johannes haben wollten, oder Einen, der nicht nur nicht Apostel, sondern auch nicht einmal Augenzeuge, sondern dogmatischer Speculant spätesten Epigonenthums gewesen.' *Die Geschichte*, *ut supra*, p. 72.

[6] 'Meine Auffassung ist also keine Hypothese . . . sondern ein historischer Fund.' *Das vierte Evangelium, u.s.w.*, *ut supra*, Vorbericht, p. vii.

[7] Martineau, *ut supra*, p. 243.

[8] Delff, *Das vierte Evangelium*, *ut supra*, p. 1.

[9] *Ut supra*, p. 189.

[1] 'In meiner "Geschichte des Rabbi Jesus" habe ich nachgewiesen, dass das vierte Evan-

period, Dr. Martineau regards it as established that the writer of the Fourth Gospel 'uses a dialect, and speaks in tones, to which the first century was strange, and which were never heard till a generation born in the second was in mid-life;'[2] . . . 'not till we listen to the Apologists, in the time of the Antonines, does this new language fall upon the ear.'[3] Dr. Delff thinks it to be clear that the work is distinctly the product of Judaism; that it belongs to Jerusalem, when the sacred city was still standing; and that its special purpose was not that the heathen, or even the Jews, in a wide sense, but that the class to which the writer belonged—the rulers, the chief priests—should believe.[4]

subjective criticism, Dr. Martineau thinks that 'wherever a critic pretends, by the mere keenness of his unaided eye, to have detected the author in some unheard-of quarter, . . . we justly look on the pretension as audacious, and its proofs as a waste of ingenuity.'[5] Dr. Delff regards the theory that the author was a person named John, a dweller in Jerusalem, of high-priestly rank,[6] who became a disciple of Jesus, and after the

---

gelium in der Gestalt, in der es in den Kanon aufgenommen ist, ausser den allgemein anerkannten Interpolationen: 5, 4. 7, 53—8, 12 und Cap. 21 noch verschiedene andre enthält, und zwar kleinere die folgenden: 2, 17. 21. 22. 4, 44. 6, 44. 54. 7, 39. 12, 16. 33. 13, 20—grössere 1, 1—6 und 9—19. 2, 1—11. 4. 46—fin. 5, 19—30. 6, 1—30, 37—40. 59. 12, 26—31. 20, 11—19.' *Das vierte Evangelium*, *ut supra*, p. 11. Cf. *Geschichte*, *ut supra*, pp. 97 sqq.

[2] *Ut supra*, p. 236.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 237.

[4] *Das vierte Evangelium*, *ut supra*, pp. viii, ix.

[5] *Ut supra*, p. 191.

[6] But cf. Weizsäcker, *Das Apostolische Zeitalter*, 1890, p. 500.

destruction of Jerusalem found his way to Asia Minor and became in the recollections of the next generation the 'presbyter John,' but is wholly distinct from the Apostle John, as his own discovery, which solves the chief problems, not only of the Fourth Gospel, but of Christianity itself.[7]

compared, and found to be diametrically opposed.

But I need not weary you with the details. Our philosophical critics of to-day are not unlike the more ordinary critics who have gone before. It is not too much to assert that while they agree that the Gospel is not written by the Apostle John, they not only differ, but they are diametrically opposed as to every fact and every reason upon which that opinion is supported.

Conclusion.

Here our sketch of the history of the negative criticism of the Fourth Gospel, which, imperfect as it has necessarily been, may, I fear, seem to have been unduly extended in proportion to our time, must be brought to a close. We may not now pause to characterize it, as a whole or in its separate parts. The words of our text are :—

And not even so did their witness agree together.

We will in the next lecture consider, in so far as its limits will permit, the position of modern positive criticism in relation to our subject.

---

[7] *Das vierte Evangelium, ut supra,* p. 1.

LECTURE VI

‘OUR AGE’

THE POSITIVE CRITICISM

'IF THE SUBJECT BE EXTENSIVE—IF IT BE ONE OF THE GREAT DEPARTMENTS INTO WHICH HUMAN KNOWLEDGE IS DIVIDED—A CAREFUL STUDY OF IT, CONTINUED FOR SEVERAL YEARS, OR EVEN FOR A LARGE PART OF A LIFE, COMBINED WITH FREQUENT MEDITATION, AND, IF POSSIBLE, PERSONAL OBSERVATION, IS REQUISITE IN ORDER TO ENABLE A MAN TO UNDERSTAND IT THOROUGHLY AND TO TREAT IT WITH A SOUND AND COMPREHENSIVE JUDGMENT. ALL THE GREAT LUMINARIES OF SCIENCE, WHETHER MATHEMATICAL, PHYSICAL, METAPHYSICAL, ETHICAL, OR POLITICAL, HAVE FULFILLED THIS CONDITION. NONE OF THEM WOULD HAVE ACQUIRED THE AUTHORITY WHICH THEIR OPINIONS, AS SUCH, INDEPENDENTLY OF THEIR REASONS, POSSESS, IF THEY HAD NOT APPLIED ALL THEIR MENTAL FACULTIES DURING A LARGER PART OF THEIR LIVES TO THE SUBJECTS ON WHICH THEY WROTE.' . . . .

'THE AGREEMENT OF COMPETENT JUDGES UPON A SPECULATIVE OPINION IS ANALOGOUS TO THE AGREEMENT OF CREDIBLE WITNESSES IN THEIR TESTIMONY TO A FACT, THE VALUE OF THEIR CONCURRENT TESTIMONY IS MORE THAN TEN TIMES THE VALUE OF THE TESTIMONY OF EACH.* SO THE JOINT PROBABILITY OF THE AGREEMENT OF TEN COMPETENT JUDGES IN A RIGHT OPINION IS FAR GREATER THAN THE SUM OF THE PROBABILITIES OF THE RECTITUDE OF THE OPINION OF EACH TAKEN SEPARATELY.' . . . .

. . . . 'REASON DOES NOT FORBID, BUT PRESCRIBES A RELIANCE UPON AUTHORITY. WHERE A PERSON IS NECESSARILY IGNORANT OF THE GROUNDS OF DECISION, TO DECIDE FOR HIMSELF IS AN ACT OF SUICIDAL FOLLY. HE OUGHT TO RECUR TO A COMPETENT ADVISER, AS A BLIND MAN RELIES UPON A GUIDE.'

Cornewall Lewis.

---

* Cf. Campbell, p. 52.

LECTURE VI.

At the mouth of two witnesses or three shall every word be established.—2 Cor. xiii. 1.

Introduction.

WE have already felt how impossible it is within the limits of two lectures to draw even a brief outline of the negative criticism of this century, and it certainly would not be easy, within the limits of one, to trace with anything like fulness the succession of thinkers who have been led by the attack upon the Fourth Gospel to examine the position of their opponents, and to re-examine the grounds of their own convictions; and who, as a result of this testing process, have maintained and strengthened their belief in the Johannine authorship. I am the less careful however to present in its fulness this part of our subject, as even a cursory examination of it must show how strong the position is, and I shall willingly content myself with a reference to some representative thinkers.

Schleiermacher, 1768–1834.

The immediate results of the works of Evanson and Bretschneider have been sufficiently before us, and I pass therefore at once to consider the witness of Schleiermacher.

Friedrich Schleiermacher had already made his

His position, mark when the University of Berlin was founded in 1810, and after taking a leading part in its organization became in name the first Professor, and in reality the most important living teacher, of Theology. De Wette was at first (from 1810 to 1819) his colleague in the new University, and among his pupils were Bleek, Lücke, Neander, Nitzsch, Ullmann, Julius Müller, and influence, for a time Strauss. This is not the place to speak of the far-reaching extent of Schleiermacher's work and influence, which have left perhaps, if all things are considered, a deeper and wider impression than those of any man in this century. The *Life and Letters* of the modern Plato have been placed within our reach and help us to realize something at least of what the and character. man was.[1] If you would know Schleiermacher, read, for example, the youth's letter to his father, when passing through a crisis of faith which but for the son's confidence and the father's affection might have shattered his life.[2] Meditate upon the man's declaration to his friend Jacobi, 'Understanding and feeling in me also remain distinct, but they touch each other and form a galvanic pile. To me it seems that the innermost life of the spirit consists in the galvanic action thus produced in the feeling of the understanding and the understanding of the feeling, during which, however, the two poles always remain deflected from each other.'[3] Be present for a moment at the final gathering of the family on earth. He has been racked for days by acute sufferings. He says:—'Inwardly I enjoy heavenly moments. I feel constrained to think the profoundest speculative thoughts, and they are to me identical with the deepest religious feelings.' He pronounced the words of consecration at the Holy Communion immediately before his death, and added:—'On these words of the scripture I rely; they are the foundation of my faith. . . . In this love and communion we are, and ever will remain, united.'[4] Such was the man, Friedrich Schleiermacher.

---

[1] Jonas u. Dilthey, *Aus Schleiermacher's Leben in Briefen*, 4 vols. 1858–61; the earlier part in English by Frederica Rowan, 2 vols. 1860. Dilthey, *Leben Schleiermacher's*, 1867.

[2] *Life*, by F. Rowan, i. pp. 46 sqq. Cf. Dilthey, *Leben*, pp. 23 sqq.

His writings.

Schleiermacher was a theologian and a philosopher rather than an expert in biblical criticism, and was concerned with the present rather than with the past, and with the contents of the Bible rather than with its form; but in the early part of his literary life, he had devoted attention to the criticism of some of the books of the New Testament, and that in a spirit of extreme freedom.[5] One result of this, well known to English readers, is the *Critical Essay on the Gospel of S. Luke*.[6] Another result, which is not so well known, is his work on the *First Epistle to Timothy*.[7]

---

[3] See the whole letter in *Life*, by F. Rowan, ii. pp. 280–84. Cf. Lichtenberger, *Histoire des idées religieuses*, tom. ii. p. 66.

[4] *Life*, *ut supra*, ii. pp. 337–39. Cf. *Histoire*, *ut supra*, ii. pp. 237–38.

[5] Cf. *Reden über die Religion*, ed. i. 1799.

[6] *Critical Essay on the Gospel of S. Luke, with Introduction by the translator* (Mr. Connop Thirlwall, afterwards Bishop of S. David's), 1825.

[7] *Ueber den sogenannten ersten Brief des Paulos an den Timotheos*,

Free treatment of New Testament.

And this free treatment of the New Testament writings was continued in his later studies, for we find him in effect giving up also the Apostolic authorship of the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Hebrews, the Second and Third Epistles of John, the Second Epistle of Peter, and the Epistles of James and Jude. While doubtful about the Acts of the Apostles and the Synoptics, and most doubtful of all about the Apocalypse,[8] he takes the position that the Johannine Christ is the true historic Christ, and that the Synoptic sketches are to be corrected from this picture. Christianity would be a phenomenon without explanation if it were founded only on the Synoptic Gospels.

Special views on the Fourth Gospel.

His special views on the Fourth Gospel appear first in a series of *Explanations* appended to the third edition of the *Discourses on Religion*, which was published in 1821, at the height of the excitement caused by Bretschneider's *Probabilia*. In one of these *Explanations*, which comes at the end of the fifth discourse, he says :—

> Nothing can well betray less appreciation of the essence of Christianity and of the person of Christ Himself, and especially less historic sense and comprehension of the way in which great events come to pass and the conditions in which they must find their real basis, than the opinion which was some time ago quietly introduced—that John had mingled much of his own ideas with the discourses of Christ. Now, however, that this view has secretly strengthened and fortified

---

1807. *Sämmtliche Werke*, Abth. i. *Zur Theologie*, Bd. 2. *Werke*, 1845, Abth. i. Bd. 8, pp. 315–344.

[8] *Einleitung ins Neue Testament.*

itself and adopted critical weapons, it risks the more destructive assertion, that John did not write the Gospel, but that it was a later author who invented this mythical Christ. But how it could be possible for a Jewish Rabbi, with humanitarian sentiments, a somewhat Socratic system of ethics, a few miracles (or, at least, what others took for miracles), and a talent for introducing happy maxims and parables—for when we have said this we have said all, indeed he will have to be forgiven a few follies according to the other Evangelists—how a man like this could have produced such an influence as a new religion and Church—for such a man, had he existed, would not have been worthy to be compared to Moses and Mahomet—all this is left to our own comprehension. Yet the issue must be a critical battle, for which those who love and reverence the Johannine Son of God are doubtless already arming themselves.[9]

Johannine authorship upheld throughout.

In Schleiermacher's *Introduction to the New Testament*[1] he bases the Apostolic authorship of the Fourth Gospel on the consistency of the presentation, and sweeps away any difficulties in detail by the strength of the impression as a whole—*Die Macht des Total-Eindruckes*, as he was wont to say.[2] These principles were further illustrated in the author's *Life of Jesus*,[3] where he goes so far as to assert that to the Johannine Gospel must be given the priority of time[4] as well as of position; indeed it became almost an axiom of Schleiermacher and his school, that the Fourth Gospel was beyond question; and that if discrepancy should ever be established between it and the Synoptics, the former was to be at all costs accepted.

---

[9] *Reden über die Religion. Werke*, Abth. i. Bd. 1, 1843, pp. 447 sq.; and the critical edition of 1879, pp. 297 sq. This is by G. C. B. Pünjer, who gives a concise and interesting account of the different editions in his Introduction.

[1] *Einleitung, ut supra*, pp. 315–344.

[2] 'Es ist also recht gut, dass diese Sache einmal zur Sprache gebracht ist, und alle Zweifelsgründe gegen das Johannesevangelium zusammen gestellt sind, und so scheint es auch Bretschneider gemeint zu haben, der seine Hypothese später so gut wie zurück genommen hat. Aber dass unter diesen Einzelheiten irgend Etwas von solcher Erheblichkeit sei, dass man gegen den Totaleindruck des ganzen die Aechtheit bezweifeln müsste, wird wohl Niemand mehr meinen.' *Einleitung, ut supra*, p. 340. Cf. p. 315.

Neander, 1789–1850.

Among the youths of Germany who felt the wave of the great influence which was exercised by Schleiermacher's *Discourses on Religion* was David Mendel, the son of a Jewish pedlar, who was living at Hamburg with a poor and worse than widowed mother, and was supported at the gymnasium by the liberality of friends. Of this lad, when grown to manhood, a living writer whose special knowledge and judgment give him every right to command our confidence, says that he was 'the most original phenomenon in the literary world of this nineteenth century,'[5] and general opinion has held him to be father of the modern philosophic, as distinguished from the previous dogmatic, history of the Church. Trained to be a jurist, he was being fashioned as a historian; brought up in Judaism, he was being prepared to teach the history of the development of Christianity.

---

[3] *Das Leben Jesu*, 1832, ed. Rütenik, 1864. *Werke*, Abth. i. Bd. 6, pp. 37–44. This 'Lecture' on the *Quellen* was delivered on May 23, 1832.

[4] 'Sehen wir aber die Sache so an: das Evangelium Johannis ist das erste, zu der Zeit als Johannes sein Evangelium schrieb, existirten die Bestandtheile der anderen Evangelien nur erst zerstreut und wurden erst später gesammelt.' . . *Leben Jesu, ut supra*, p. 420. Cf. Strauss, *Der Christus des Glaubens u.s.w. Kritik des Schleiermacher'schen Lebens Jesu*, 1865, pp. 45 sqq.

[5] Schaff, *Germany; its Universities, Theology, and Religion*, 1857, p. 270.

Change of name.

In his seventeenth year David Mendel carried his convictions into practice by being publicly baptized in Hamburg, and, true to the ancient custom of his race, signified the change of being by a change of the name which distinguished that being. From February 25, 1806, onwards he was no longer a Jew, Mendel, but a new man in Christ Jesus, Neander (Newman).[6]

Special qualifications.

Of the special qualifications of this Christian-Jew to judge of a Christian-Jewish writing, of his minute acquaintance with Gnosticism and the philosophies of the second century which engaged his attention from the first,[7] of his trained historical mind and vast historical knowledge, of his whole-hearted devotion to his studies and his students during the thirty-eight years of his professoriate in Berlin, it is hardly necessary to make mention. Such was the general fitness of Neander to form an opinion upon the Fourth Gospel. If we remember also that he commenced his work in Berlin in 1813 by a course of 'Lectures on S. John,' and completed it in 1850 by announcing from his deathbed a course of 'Lectures on the Gospel of S. John,' and that he prepared with scrupulous care four editions of his *Life of Jesus*, extending from 1837 to 1845—the significance of these years will be borne in mind—we shall be prepared to value rightly the following statement about the Fourth Gospel :—

---

[6] As many variations occur in the accounts, it may be well to refer to the original entry in the baptismal register of the church of St. Catharine, Hamburg, which is quoted by Krabbe, *August Neander*, 1852, p. 18. The Christian names chosen, Johann, August, Wilhelm, were those of the witnesses (*Taufzeugen*).

[7] *De fidei gnoseosque christianæ idea . . . secundum mentem Clementis Alex.* Heidelbergæ, 1811. *Genetische Entwickelung der vornehmsten gnostischen Systeme*, 1818. *Anti-Gnosticus: Geist des Tertullianus u. Einleitung in dessen Schriften*, 1825.

His opinion.

> It could have emanated from none other than that 'beloved disciple' upon whose soul the image of the Saviour had left its deepest impress. So far from this Gospel's having been written by a man of the second century (as some assert), we cannot even imagine a man existing in that century so little affected by the contrarieties of his times, and so far exalted above them. Could an age involved in perpetual contradictions, an age of religious materialism, anthropomorphism, and one-sided intellectualism have given birth to a production like this, which bears the stamp of none of these deformities? How mighty must the man have been who, in *that* age, could produce from his own mind such an image of Christ as this? And this man, too, in a period almost destitute of eminent minds, remained in total obscurity! Was it necessary for the master-spirit, who felt in himself the capacity and the calling to accomplish the greatest achievement of his day, to resort to a pitiful trick to smuggle his ideas into circulation?
>
> And then, too, while it is thought sufficient to say of the three other Gospels that they were compiled from undesigned fables, we are told that such a Gospel as this of John was the work of sheer invention, as lately *Dr. Baur* has confessed, with praiseworthy candour. Strange that a man, anxious for the credit of his inventions, should, in the chronology and topography of his Life of Christ, give the lie to the Church traditions of his time, instead of chiming in with them; stranger still, that in spite of his bold contradiction of the

opinions of his age in regard to the history, his fraud should be successful! In short, the more openly this criticism declares itself against the Gospel of John, the more palpably does it manifest its own wilful disregard of history.[8]

De Wette, 1780–1849.

One of Schleiermacher's first colleagues and most intimate friends in the new University of Berlin, was Dr. Wilhelm de Wette, and no one of the band laboured more earnestly in the interests of rational theology and scientific conceptions of both the Old and the New Testaments. He had prepared a considerable work on the Pentateuch, which was anticipated by the publication of Vater's *Commentary* in 1803, and was therefore published only in abstract, and as a supplement to Vater's work. This, with other early essays, sufficiently shows the liberal point of view, to say the least, from which De Wette approached his studies. A letter of generous sympathy—more generous, perhaps, than wise—to the mother of Ludwig Sand, a student who in a passionate impulse of liberal patriotism had murdered one whom he thought to be an advocate of oppression, reveals the strong tendency, which runs all through De Wette's work, to protect at any cost the weaker side, and to be held back by no reverence for conventionalities from that which seemed to him to be right. But that letter cost him his professor's chair, and cost the young university one of its ablest men. In vain Schleiermacher and others pleaded for their colleague, in vain they pleaded

Early essays.

His character.

---

[8] Neander, *Das Leben Jesu Christi*, ed. 4, 1845, pp. 11, 12. Eng. Trans. 1851, pp. 7, 8.

for the interests of the university. The autocratic king would hear of no excuse, and in 1819 De Wette left Berlin for a temporary retirement at Weimar, whence he was to be called in 1823 to Basel. Here for twenty-six years he devoted himself to the work of his professorship and to philanthropic labours, such as the formation of a 'Society for protecting the Greeks against the oppression of the Turks;' and was throughout a consistent leader of the party of progress. He has sketched his own character in a novel, *Theodore, or the Consecration of the Sceptic*,[9] which he wrote at Weimar in 1822, and to which Tholuck replied in the *True Consecration of the Doubter*.[1] The late Dr. Schenkel, who was De Wette's pupil, and had himself certainly no leanings to conservative orthodoxy, speaks of his memory with touching gratitude, and represents the leading principle of his theological labours to be that 'truth in none of its relations of life, least of all in theology and the church, can exist without freedom, or freedom without truth.'[2]

Liberal views.

The Johannine question.

De Wette was in the thick of the discussion on the Johannine question through the whole period of Evanson, Bretschneider, Strauss, and Baur, and it is natural to expect both that he should write on the subject, and that he should lean to the negative view. He did write on the subject, both in his *Introduction to the New Testament*, the editions of which extend from 1826 to 1848, and in his *Concise Exegetical Commentary*, the editions of which extend from 1837 to 1846.[3]

---

[9] *Theodor, oder des Zweiflers Weihe*, Berlin, 1822.

[1] *Die Lehre von der Sünde u. vom Versöhner, oder die wahre Weihe des Zweiflers*, ed. 7, 1851, Hamburg.

[2] 'Dass in allen Verhältnissen des Lebens, zumal aber in Theologie u. Kirche, die Wahrheit nicht bestehen kann ohne die Freiheit, u. die Freiheit nicht ohne die Wahrheit.' Schenkel, *W. M. L. de Wette und die Bedeutung seiner Theologie für unsere Zeit*, 1849, p. 111.

The *Introduction.*

In the first edition of the *Introduction*, when the effect of Bretschneider's *Probabilia* was still strongly felt, De Wette was inclined to take a middle course, and to regard the authorship as not proven. After the publication of the theories of Strauss and Baur, and under the influence of Bleek's *Contributions to Criticism of the Gospels*,[4] he became more conservative.

In the fifth edition of the *Introduction*, 1848, he says :—

> It will be found that I have placed myself decidedly more than heretofore among the defenders of the Gospel of John, although I am still far from being so decided as my friend Bleek.[5] . . . .

And again :—

> A critical conclusion which denies to the Apostle John all share in this Gospel, and declares the same to be of later origin, not only involves the odious but inevitable confession

---

[3] *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die kanonischen Bücher des Neuen Testaments*, ed. 1, 1826 ; ed. 5, 1848 ; *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Neuen Testament : Johannes*, ed. 1, 1837 ; ed. 3, 1846.

[4] Cf. *infra*, p. 314.

[5] Preface to ed. 5, Eng. Trans. by Frothingham, 1858, pp. vii and viii.

that the author was a forger, but is opposed by the improbability that Christian antiquity accepted a Gospel which differed in important points from the evangelic tradition without having found a sure and satisfactory ground in its apostolic authority.[6] . . . .

The *Commentary.*

And again in his *Commentary* :—

> The recognition of the Johannine authorship of our Gospel will even after the latest and most violent attacks never lose its hold in the Church, though it is to be hoped we shall learn to test the doubts which are brought against it with less prejudice; and criticism will as little solve the problem of explaining the mysterious origin of this Gospel as she will lift the veil which rests upon the early history of Christianity.[7]

Lücke, 1781–1855.

The Berlin group.

Another of the group of Schleiermacher's pupils and friends was Dr. Gottfried Lücke, who joined him as a lecturer at Berlin in 1816, and was afterwards Professor of Theology in the new University of Bonn 1818–27, and in Göttingen 1827–55. Lücke, in his *Commentary*,[8] which is known to all students of the Johannine writings, speaks of Schleiermacher as his 'spiritual father;'[9] and reminds his old friend Hossbach of the scientific revolution caused by Schleiermacher, De Wette, and Neander, and of their studies together in the crisis which followed the year 'thirteen.'[1] And in De Wette's *Handbook to the*

---

[6] *Einleitung*, ed. 5, Eng. Trans. 1858, *ut supra*, p. 212.

[7] *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*, ed. 3, Bd. i. Th. 3, p. 9.

[8] *Commentar über die Schriften des Evangelisten Johannes*, 1820; ed. 2, 1833; ed. 3, part i. 1840.

[9] *Ibid.* ed. 3, p. viii.

[1] *Ibid.* p. vii.

New Testament, which is dedicated to Lücke, there is a touching reference to the good old days

> when we lived and worked and disputed together in Berlin, and often had the never-to-be-forgotten Schleiermacher in our midst.[2]

The *Commentary.*

Of Lücke's *Commentary*, De Wette says with justice that

> with the first appearance of this work began a new and better era of New Testament interpretation,[3]

and to this day it remains the classic and unequalled Commentary on S. John. The author did not confine himself to exegetical studies, but they had the chief attraction for him, and the *opus magnum* of his life was the interpretation of S. John's writings. He brought to his task stores of wide and accurate learning, and applied to it for the first time the principles and results of exact philological and grammatical knowledge. But he never forgot that the religious sense is also a necessary qualification for understanding a religious work. He is an artist, a poet, a mystic, as well as a grammarian, a philologer, a thinker. 'No man,' to use his own expression, 'can really seek, but the man who hopes to find'; and while others were forming theories of what the Fourth Gospel ought to have been and then making its facts agree with their theories, Lücke's receptive spirit was really seeking, really finding, what the Fourth Gospel was; and it was to him through the whole

The religious sense.

---

[2] *Handbuch*, ed. 3, *Johannes*, Bd. i. Th. 3, Dedication.

[3] *Ibid.*

course of his investigations, as it was to Schleiermacher, 'the chief, the most delicate, the most profound of all the Gospels.'[4]

Acquaintance with the newer theories.

Not that Lücke remained ignorant of, or uninterested in, any of the newer theories. He discusses the authorship and cognate questions with full reference to them.[5] Let his own words tell us his relation to these theories :—

> I have diligently used the newer exegetical works on the Gospel and have gladly learnt from them. I have also been careful to examine the more recent and critical treatises on its genuineness and authenticity, and as far as in me lies I have honestly tested them. You will find that though I am unshaken in my convictions I have at the same time gladly recognized truth and right on the opposite side. It is, indeed, no good to disguise from oneself and others weak points and defects in the historical and exegetical grounds of belief, when once they have made themselves felt. A hidden blemish is the most dangerous. Only the real and the true, only the perfectly sound can bear the searchings of faith and of knowledge. I have therefore given up much in the interests of truth that seemed to me untenable, however dear it had become to me.[6]

And again :—

> Where I have to learn from others I seek the truth and accept it, when once clearly shown, without caring whether the man with whom I find it be rationalist, pietist, or anything else, or whether he be my friend or my foe. That is my orthodoxy.[7]

---

[4] Cf. Lichtenberger, *Histoire des idées religieuses*, 1873, tom. iii. pp. 124–5.

[5] *Commentar*, ed. 3, pp. 89–246.

[6] *Ibid.* ed. 3, pp. ix sq.

[7] *Ibid.* p. xii.

The result of his investigations pursued in this spirit and with resources such as up to that time had certainly never been combined in any writer on the Fourth Gospel, and pursued, let us again remind ourselves, in the very midst of the negative criticism, when the impulse of the attack was felt as a living power and not merely as an abstract theory—the third edition from which I am quoting was published in 1840—is that Lücke accepts the common opinion that John was the author of the Fourth Gospel,[8] and that Ephesus is the place at which the Gospel was written ;[9] but thinks that there are no *data* by which the time can be fixed within nearer limits than from the seventh to the tenth decades of the first century ; and that it was not earlier than the year A.D. 80, but that how near it was to the death of the Apostle, cannot be definitely stated.[1]

Result of his criticism.

Dr. Friedrich Bleek was also, like Lücke, a pupil and friend of Schleiermacher, and, under his influence, began to lecture at Berlin in 1818. Five years later he obtained a professor's chair there, but left it in 1829 for the professorship at Bonn which furnished the work of his life. All men agree in their estimate of the massive solidity of Bleek's learning and the absolute fairness of his judgment. 'He seems to me,' says the English essayist, who has himself shown the greatest mastery of Baur's theory, 'nearly the

Bleek, 1795–1859.

Estimate of his powers.

---

[8] *Commentar*, *ut supra*, pp. 6–160.
[9] *Ibid.* pp. 161 sq.
[1] *Ibid.* p. 167.

only opponent of Baur I have met with worthy, both from his candour and his ability, to cope with him.'[2] These qualities were first fully appreciated when Dr. Bleek published an edition of the Epistle to the Hebrews.[3] He wrote for the Berlin *Society for Scientific Criticism*, in 1844, a review, which was published in that and the following year,[4] of Ebrard's *Scientific Criticism of the Gospel History*.[5] The review attracted considerable attention, for it contained substantial additions to the subject, which was one that had occupied a prominent place in the writer's winter course of professorial lectures. It was republished, in an enlarged form, in 1846, and dedicated to De Wette.[6] It deals principally with the Johannine question, and is justly regarded as an able, impartial, and convincing defence of the authenticity of the Gospel. De Wette acknowledges its effect upon himself.[7] After Bleek's death his lectures on *Introduction to the New Testament*[8] were edited by his son. The later editions[9] have been edited by Dr. Mangold.[1] The Johannine problem is treated with great fulness and erudition, and a portion of it has been published separately as a French treatise.[2] The additions of

Earlier writings.

The *Beiträge*.

The *Introduction*.

---

[2] R. H. Hutton, *Theological Essays*, ed. 3, 1888, p. 209.

[3] *Brief an die Hebräer*, 1828–36–40.

[4] *Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik*, 1844, Bd. ii. Nos. 61–65; 1845, Bd. i. Nos. 41–46.

[5] *Vide infra*, p. 317.

[6] *Beiträge zur Evangelien-Kritik*, 1846.

[7] *Vide supra*, p. 309.

[8] *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, ed. 1, 1860; ed. 2, 1866.

[9] Ed. 3, 1875; ed. 4, 1886.

[1] Cf. Lecture V. p. 262.

[2] Ch. Bruston, *Étude critique sur l'évangile selon Saint Jean*, 1864.

Dr. Mangold bring the work up to the present date with an erudition which is in harmony with Bleek's, though the opinion as to the authorship of the Fourth Gospel is not. He is not himself able, as we have seen, to accept the authenticity, because he feels the force of the objection on internal grounds; but he bears abundant witness to the ability and candour of Bleek himself, who held throughout the Johannine authorship in the fullest sense.

Bunsen, 1791–1860.

No man filled a more prominent place in the eyes of the churches, the nations, the philanthropists, the scholars of the last generation than the Baron de Bunsen. The pupil of Heyne and Lachmann; the early friend of Niebuhr and Neander, and in this country of Arnold, Maurice, Hare, and Stanley; the patron of Holtzmann and De Lagarde; himself a scholar, a theologian, a jurist, a statesman, a man of affairs, and in touch with the first minds of Europe; a layman also, and one of singular freedom from prejudice—unless it be a prejudice for freedom—his opinion is of exceptional value both from his access to evidence, and his power of forming a judgment upon it. It is none other than Dr. Thomas Arnold who writes of Baron de Bunsen:—

Arnold's opinion of him.

> I could not express my sense of what Bunsen is without seeming to be exaggerating; but I think if you could hear and see him even for one half-hour, you would understand my feeling towards him. He is a man in whom God's graces and gifts are more united than in any other person whom I ever saw. I have seen men as holy, as amiable, as able; but

> I never knew one who was all three in so extraordinary a degree, and combined with a knowledge of things new and old, sacred and profane, so rich, so accurate, so profound, that I never knew it equalled or approached by any man.[3]

Fourth Gospel a 'cardinal point.'

And to Bunsen the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel is a cardinal point of faith. To him if there is no historic S. John, there is no historic Christ, there is no Christianity :—

> If the Gospel of John is not an historical treatise by an eye-witness, but a myth, then there is no historical Christ, and without an historical Christ universal belief in Christ is a dream — all Christian knowledge hypocrisy or delusion, Christian reverence for God an imposture, and, finally, the Reformation a crime or madness.[4]

---

[3] Stanley, *Life and Correspondence of Dr. Arnold*, 1844, vol. ii. p. 137.

[4] 'Ist das Evangelium des Johannes kein geschichtlicher Bericht des Augenzeugen, sondern ein Mythus, so gibt es keinen geschichtlichen Christus, und ohne einen geschichtlichen Christus ist aller gemeindliche Christenglaube ein Wahn, alles christliche Bekenntniss Heuchelei oder Täuschung, die christliche Gottesverehrung eine Gaukelei, die Reformation endlich ein Verbrechen oder ein Wahnsinn.'—*Vollständiges Bibelwerk*, 1858, Bd. i. *Vorwort*, p. x.

I have not added the weighty authority of Credner to the list of those who support the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel, though he does so in the strongest terms in his learned *Introduction* ('So ist doch aus diesen Streitigkeiten das Johanneische Evangelium nach bestandener Feuerprobe siegreich und gleich einem verjüngten Phönix hervorgegangen . . .' *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 1836, p. 262), and maintains the view in his *New Testament* (*Das Neue Testament*, 1847), because, in his posthumous *History of the Canon*, edited by Volkmar (cf. Lecture II. p. 57), he is said to have abandoned it. ('Am misslichsten endlich steht es mit den ältesten Zeugnissen für das Ev. nach *Matthäus* u. nach *Johannes*.' *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanon*, 1860, p. 6. See also references in Volkmar's *Register*.)

Ebrard, 1818–

Dr. Johann Heinrich August Ebrard may be taken to represent the school of Erlangen, where he was born, and where, as well as at Zürich, he was professor. Among his numerous writings are the following works on our present subject: *Scientific Criticism of the Gospel History*, which, as we have seen, gave rise to Bleek's essay; *The Gospel of John and the latest Hypothesis on its Origin; The Revelation of John; The Epistles of John.*[5] All are both learned and able; and though as against an adversary his position is often weakened by excessive strength of language, it is always based upon a solid foundation of knowledge. His conclusion with regard to the Fourth Gospel, after a careful examination of the evidence and a survey of the modern objections, is:—

Writings on the subject.

Strong views on the Fourth Gospel,

> . . . that, with the exception of some of Paul's Epistles, no book can be found throughout the whole of the ancient literature, both Christian and profane, which can show such numerous and reliable proofs of its genuineness as the Gospel of John.[6]

And again:—

> Till figs grow upon thistles, the genuineness of the Gospel of John will continue firm and impregnable in the estimation of all who do not rank with the thistles themselves.[7]

---

[5] *Wissenschaftliche Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte*, 1842, ed. 3, 1868; Eng. Trans. 1863; *Das Evangelium Johannis und die neueste Hypothese über seine Entstehun* 1845; *Die Offenbarung Johannis*, 1853; *Die Briefe Johannis*, 1859; Eng. Trans. 1860.

[6] *Gospel History*, 1863, Eng. Trans. p. 598.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 600.

and on negative criticism.

His view of the negative criticism of the Gospel is summed up in these terms :—

> There was a time when Teller's Lexicon was admired and esteemed by many contemporaries, as much as Zeller's annuals are now. There was a time when the way in which *Paulus* endeavoured to bring the consciousness of the age into harmony with the writings of the New Testament was lauded as unparaleled in its acuteness. There was a time when *Strauss's* mythical hypothesis appeared to shake the foundations of the world. But now *Teller* is laughed at ; at the name of *Paulus* men shrug their shoulders ; *Strauss's* mythical hypothesis has been quietly laid aside as useless by the most kindred spirit, to make room for the hypothesis of a *pious fraud.* The time will come when men will not merely laugh, but shudder at such a hypothesis as this.[8]

Tholuck, 1799–1877.

Hengstenberg, 1808–1869.

Their commentaries

No sketch, however brief it may be, of the German positive criticism of the last half century, could omit the names of Tholuck of Halle, and Hengstenberg of Berlin ; but I must refer to them only to pass by them. Men of wholly different characters, they were alike in this : that they exercised a very wide influence over successive generations of students and pastors at home and abroad—Tholuck, by the charm of his personal influence, Hengstenberg, by the pages of the *Evangelical Church Journal*[9]—and that their many works had an enormous circulation. Both wrote, among other works, important commentaries on the Fourth Gospel ;[1] both threw the whole weight of their influence into the defence of the authenticity, but they do not contribute any such substantial addition to the facts or the arguments as to demand our special attention. It should, however, be noted that their exposition of the text and their general position as witnesses have a distinct value, derived from their quite unusual knowledge of the Semitic languages and of the Old Testament.

---

[8] *Gospel History*, pp. 600 sq.

[9] Cf. Lecture IV. pp. 192 sq.

[1] Tholuck, *Commentar zum Evangelium Johannis*, 1827, ed. 7, 1857 ; Eng. Trans. 1836 and 1859 ; *Die Glaubwürdigkeit der evange-*

on S. John.

Dr. Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer is known to all students of the New Testament by his *Critical and Exegetical Commentary*.[2] The first edition of the portion on the Fourth Gospel was published as long ago as 1834; the fifth—and the last during the author's life—in 1869; the seventh, edited by Dr. Bernhard Weiss, in 1886. Meyer's study of S. John was, therefore, contemporaneous with the influence of Strauss and Baur. His last edition contains a critical *Introduction* which fills fifty-five pages of the English edition, and ends by giving Ephesus as the place, and A.D. 80 as the approximate time. But I invite your special attention to the following words in which the aged chief of commentators reviews, in his own farewell, the negative criticism of the half century during which he had himself felt the pulse of every movement of New Testament thought and knowledge:—

Meyer, 1800–1873.

Wide range of work and time.

---

lischen Geschichte, 1837–38. Hengstenberg, *Das Evangelium des heiligen Johannes*, 3 vols. 1863, ed. 2, 1867; Eng. Trans. 1865.

[2] *Kritisch-exegetisches Handbuch: Johannes*, ed. 1, 1834; ed. 5, 1869, Eng. Trans. 1874; ed. 7, 1886.

Review of the negative criticism.

Such critical labour submits itself to be tried by the judgment of scholars, and has its scientific warrant. Nay, should it succeed in demonstrating that the declaration of the Gospel's apostolic birth, as written by all the Christian centuries, is erroneous, we would have to do honour to the truth, which in this case also, though painful at first, could not fail to approve itself that which maketh free. There is, however, adequate reason to entertain very grave doubts of the attainment of this result, and to refuse assent to the prognostication of universal victory, which has been too hastily associated with these efforts of criticism. Whoever is acquainted with the most recent investigations, will, indeed, gladly leave to themselves the clumsy attempts to establish a parallelism between the Gospel of John and ancient fabrications concocted with a special aim, which carry their own impress on their face; but he will still be unable to avoid the immediate and general duty of considering whether those modern investigators who deny that it is the work of the apostle have at last discovered a *time* in which — putting aside meanwhile all the substantive elements of their proof—the origin of the writing would be historically conceivable. For it is a remarkable circumstance in itself, that of the two most recent controversialists, who have treated the subject with the greatest scientific independence, the one assumes the latest, the other the earliest possible, date. If now, with the first, I place its composition not sooner than from 150 to 160, I see myself driven to the bold assertion of Volkmar,[3] who makes the evangelist sit at the feet of Justin—a piece of daring which lands me in an historical absurdity. If I rightly shrink from so preposterous a view, and prefer to follow the thoughtful Keim[4] in his more judicious estimate of the ecclesiastical testimonies and the relations of the time, then I obtain the very beginning of the second century as the period in which the work sprang up on the fruitful soil of the church of Asia

---

[3] Cf. Lecture V. pp. 236, 240 sq.

[4] Cf. Lecture V. pp. 258 sqq.

Minor, as a plant Johannine indeed in spirit, but post-Johannine in origin. But from this position also I feel myself at once irresistibly driven. For I am now brought into such immediate contact with the days in which the aged apostolic pillar was still amongst the living, and see myself transported so entirely into the living presence of his numerous Asiatic disciples and admirers, that it cannot but appear to me an absolutely insoluble enigma how precisely *then* and *there* a non-Johannine work—one, moreover, so great and so divergent from the older Gospels—could have been issued and have passed into circulation under the name of the highly honoured apostle. Those disciples and admirers, amongst whom he, as the high priest, had worn the πέταλον, could not but know whether he had written a Gospel, and if so, of what kind; and with the sure tact of sympathy and of knowledge, based upon experience, they could not but have rejected what was not a genuine legacy from their apostle. Keim, indeed, ventures upon the bold attempt of calling altogether in question the fact that John had his sphere of labour in Asia Minor; but is not this denial, in face of the traditions of the church, in fact an impossibility? It is, and must remain so, as long as the truth of historical facts is determined by the criterion of historical testimony. Turning, then, from Volkmar to Keim, I see before my eyes the fate indicated by the old proverb: τὸν καπνὸν φεύγοντα εἰς τὸ πῦρ ἐκπίπτειν.'

Delight in Luther's testimony.

. . . After all that has been said for and against up to the present time, I can have no hesitation in once more expressing my delight in the testimony of Luther—quoted now and again with an ironical smile—that '*John's Gospel is the only tender, right, chief Gospel, and is to be far preferred before the other three, and to be more highly esteemed.*' [5]

Lechler, 1811–1889.

Dr. Gotthard Victor Lechler, who died last year, after filling for thirty years a chair of Theology in the University of Leipzig, was, in his student life, a pupil of Baur at Tübingen; and to this master he was probably indebted in large measure for the remarkable power of analyzing and tracing forms of thought which characterized his works. We have examples of this in the *History of English Deism*, *John Wiclif and the Period before the Reformation*, and other important books and essays. In 1851 he published a work on *The Apostolic and post-Apostolic Times*, which had gained the prize of the Teyler Theological Society in Haarlem two years before. A remodelled edition appeared in German in 1857, and a third edition in 1885, which was published in English in the following year.[6] The author has maintained throughout, in opposition to his teacher Baur, that the forms of doctrine contained in the Fourth Gospel with the Johannine Epistles and the Apocalypse are consistent with Apostolic authorship, and admit of no other explanation.

---

[5] *Handbuch, ut supra*, Eng. Trans., Preface, pp. viii, ix. Cf. Lecture V. p. 246.

His works.

Doctrinal forms prove Johannine authorship.

In the third edition the venerable author has in effect produced a new work, and in particular has, in both the Apostolic and post-Apostolic periods, considered the *Life* before the *Doctrine*, whereas in the earlier editions, in conformity with the terms of the prize, he had considered the *Doctrine* before the *Life*. In making this fundamental change, he says:—

Change of view.

---

[6] *Das apostolische und das nachapostolische Zeitalter, mit Rücksicht auf Unterschied und Einheit in Lehre und Leben dargestellt*, ed. 1, 1851; ed. 3, 1885; Eng. Trans., 1886.

I do so with the conviction that for individuals as well as mankind, in the divine education of the human race and in sacred history, life and experience are the foundation, while consciousness, thought, and teaching form the superstructure. Godet says on John iii. 3, with truth and beauty :—

> 'Une nouvelle vue suppose une nouvelle vie.'

In this way I touch upon a fundamental view that unconsciously dominated the master of the 'critical school,' and that still seems to prevail among many of its advocates. I refer to intellectualism, to which the world of thought and knowledge appears as a thing moving round itself and concluded within itself; while the ethical world of action and suffering, especially of life that streams from the fountain of everlasting life, is to all appearance non-existent and unintelligible.[7] . . . Apart from such portions as have been worked out afresh and fully, all that I give has been subjected to repeated and honest examination. On all sides the writings and treatises relating to the entire subject published in the last decades, so far as they were accessible, have been thoroughly examined, and many former judgments changed.[8]

Intellectualism.

But his judgment of the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse has undergone no change :—

Abides by view of S. John.

> We abide firmly by unity of authorship, and recognize both writings as apostolic and Johannine.[9]

Dr. Bernhard Weiss, professor at Berlin, occupies a well-recognized position in the first rank of living theologians and New Testament critics. His works extend over a wide field, but those which deal with our present subject would even if they stood alone justify

Weiss, 1827–

His works.

---

[7] *Das apost. Zeitalter, ut supra*, ed. 3; Eng. Trans. pp. vii sq.

[8] *Ibid.* p. ix.

[9] *Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 165.

the author's high reputation for learning as well as for both exact and wide grasp of thought. He published a work on the *Doctrinal System of John* in 1862, and has since treated the subject more fully in the *Biblical Theology of the New Testament*, in the *Life of Jesus*, in his editions of *Meyer's Commentary*, and in the valuable *Introduction to the New Testament*, the second edition of which appeared only last year. Throughout this remarkable series of works, the Johannine authorship is consistently maintained, and they form from their moderation and candour as well as from their learning, on both sides of the question, one of the strongest presentations of the ancient view which has been written in modern times.[1]

Johannine authorship maintained throughout.

Dr. Weiss's conclusions are summarized in the following extract from his latest work :—

Summary

> The solution of the Johannine problem must begin at the point where Baur instituted his criticisms. It may be possible to perceive many departures of the fourth Gospel from the older ones, and to apprehend many features peculiar to it and much of the material as ideal, explaining them by new points of view from which the author set out. But it contains a fulness of detail of every kind, of supplements to the synoptic tradition, of direct contradictions to it and even of intended corrections of it, which the ingenuity of criticism

---

[1] *Der Johanneische Lehrbegriff*, 1862 ; *Lehrbuch der biblischen Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, ed. 1, 1868 ; ed. 4, 1884 ; Eng. Trans. 3 vols., 1885, esp. vol. ii. pp. 311-416 ; *Das Leben Jesu*, 2 vols., 1882 ; ed. 2, 1884 ; Eng. Trans., 3 vols., 1883-4, esp. vol. i. pp. 90-210 ; *Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 1886, ed. 2, 1889; Eng. Trans., 2 vols., 1887-8; Meyer's *Evangelium des Johannes*, ed. 6, 1880 ; ed. 7, 1886.

of his conclusions

can never trace to the author's ideal views, but on the contrary present difficulty of union with them. And it is unquestionable, that the author, who only made the reception of his work difficult through these departures from the tradition that prevailed in the Church, was limited by definite recollections or traditions which would no longer have existed in the second century. Besides, all assumption of ideal inventions is inconsistent with the weight which the Gospel lays upon the actuality of what it narrates, as Beyschlag in particular has convincingly proved; and it can be well shown that the speeches of Christ in the Gospel are absolutely unintelligible as mere expositions of the theology of logos-philosophers. But criticism has not succeeded in fixing the date of the Gospel viewed as a pseudonymous production. Apart from the fact that it is much unsettled respecting this point, the post-Apostolic time of the second century presents no person, nor even any definite tendency of thought from which a work of such spiritual significance as criticism itself allows the Gospel to be, could have emanated. The work cannot be either the cause or the product of a reconciliation of contending opposites in the second century, since such reconciliation did not take place; on the contrary, the struggle between ecclesiastical consciousness and gnosis only became sharper after Judaism had been overcome. And yet both parties frequently appealed to this very Gospel with like zeal; the gnostics first, so that the Church had every reason for disavowing a pseudonymous production so suspicious. The greatest riddle is always the pseudonymity itself. It is inconceivable that the unknown could connect his writing directly with the Apocalypse which, according to the conception of its relation to the Gospel set forth by criticism itself, and in spite of all that has been said about a certain affinity of the two works, is still thoroughly adverse to the Gospel. So also is the way inconceivable in which the writer claims for himself identity with the Apostle John, though this is only indirectly or slightly intimated; a procedure opposed to that of all pseudonymous writing; as is the fact that he directly vouches for his own ocular testimony, which can only be pronounced a plain deception.[2]

Luthardt, 1823–

Dr. Christoph Ernst Luthardt, formerly professor at Marburg, 1854–56, and since 1856 at Leipzig, has exercised a great influence as a prominent leader in the Lutheran church, an eloquent preacher and lecturer, a literary editor,[3] as well as an author. His more critical studies have been chiefly devoted to the Johannine question,[4] and these works extending over a period of more than thirty years, have become widely known to all students of the subject in their English as well as in their German form. It will be sufficient for our present purpose of estimating modern criticism on this question, to quote the following paragraphs from *S. John the Author of the Fourth Gospel*, a work which owes no small part of its value to the careful editing and references of an American scholar, Dr. Caspar Gregory:—

His works devoted to the Johannine question.

> We can now sum up the results of our inquiries as to the external attestation of the fourth gospel. We see that as soon as traces of the gospel meet us, it is testified to, both inside and outside of the Church, as a work of John's, and as a book of unquestionable apostolic authority. But these traces

---

[2] Weiss, *Manual of Introduction to the New Testament*, Eng. Trans. 1887–8, vol. ii. pp. 399, 400.

[3] *Theologische Literaturblatt*, *Evangelisch-lutherische Kirchenzeitung*, and *Zeitschrift für kirchliche Wissenschaft und Leben.*

[4] *De Compositione Evangelii Joannei*, 1852; *Das Johanneische Evangelium*, 1852–3, 2 vols.; ed. 2, 1875–6; Eng. Trans., 1878, 3 vols.; *Der Johanneische Ursprung des vierten Evangeliums*, 1874; Eng. Trans., with valuable bibliographical appendix by Gregory, 1875; *Evangelium nach Johannes* in Strack und Zöckler's *Kurzgefasster Kommentar*, 1886.

and this testimony go beyond the middle of the second century, and drive us back to the beginning of it. Now it is fixed that the apostle John lived at Ephesus, and that till late, to Trajan's time. And it is just there that we have to seek for the home of John's gospel. But the nearer to the time of John we are forced to go back with this book, the more impossible it is that the recollections of the apostle, which were still so fresh and general, would have so generally, and without opposition, let such a book as the gospel is be pressed on them if it had not been apostolic, and above all, if it had been so foreign to John's sphere of thought and to his leanings as men say it is.

Therefore the external testimony attests the Johannean composition. The character of the book itself must needs make this supposition impossible if we are not to believe this testimony. In that case there would be nothing left for us but to let this book stand as an insoluble problem. The question is, whether or not the character of the book itself forbids its composition by John.

. . . .

Result.

We may close these inquiries, then, with this result: That, choosing the most moderate expression, nothing has come in our way that disproved the tradition as to the Johannean origin of the gospel, but much that served to confirm it. The decision of the Tübingen criticism and its successors, with which the acts of this critical process were declared to be closed, was far from corresponding with the real contents of the subject, and from being ratified by the facts. In it one must make up his mind to take the Johannean question not as a historical but as a psychological question. Historically, the matter is as clear and decided as the case can be in such historical and critical inquiries. The question only concerns the psychological possibility. But we have seen that this question is not so insoluble as to be able to make a point for appeal against the historical evidence.[5]

---

[5] *Der Johanneische Ursprung*, Eng. Trans. 1875, pp. 162–3 and 278–9.

Godet, 1812–

Dr. Frédéric Godet, professor at Neuchâtel, the pupil of Neander, and the tutor of the late Emperor of Germany from 1838 to 1844, published the first edition of his *Commentary on the Gospel of S. John* in 1863–65. The second edition, completely recast, appeared in 1876–77, and a third edition, in which the work is again brought thoroughly up to date, in 1881–85.[6] It has been translated into English on both sides of the Atlantic,[7] German—in which form it has passed through several editions—Dutch, and Danish. Perhaps no Commentary on S. John has entered so fully into the spirit of the text; and the author's fine intuitive power is accompanied by a broad and vigorous intellectual grasp, which is specially felt all through the *Critical Introduction* in the first volume.[8] The result of his studies is best expressed in his own words:—

Conviction by impression,

> The result of this renewed study has been a yet firmer *scientific* conviction of the authenticity of the writing which the Church has transmitted to us under the name of John. There is another kind of conviction which arises in the heart from simply reading such a book. This conviction does not increase, it is spontaneous and hence complete from the first moment. It resembles that confiding love at first sight, that full and final impression to which thirty years of mutual life and devotion can add nothing.

and by scientific study.

> Scientific study cannot form such a tie: what it can do, is only to ward off the hostile attacks which would threaten to

---

[6] *Commentaire sur l'Évangile de Saint Jean*, 1863–65, 2 vols.; ed. 2, 'complètement refondu,' 1876–77, 3 vols.; ed. 3, 'complètement revue,' 1881–85.

[7] 1877, and from ed. 3, New York, 1886.

[8] Ed. 3, pp. 1–376.

loosen or sever it. I can truly say I have never felt this scientific certainty so fully confirmed, as after this fresh examination of the proofs on which it rests, and of the arguments recently advanced against it.[9]

Beyschlag, 1823–

Dr. Willibald Beyschlag has been since 1860 Professor of Theology in the University of Halle, and is an acknowledged leader of the liberal-evangelical party.[1] Among his numerous writings is a volume *On the Johannine Question*,[2] and a recent important work on the *Life of Jesus*.[3] During his long public career Dr. Beyschlag has consistently maintained with freedom of thought and wide critical knowledge the full Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel.

Examination of Baur's theory.

Soon after the publication of his German work on the question, he wrote two remarkable articles on *The Gospel of John and Modern Criticism* in an

---

[9] 'Le résultat de cette étude renouvelée a été chez moi la conviction *scientifique* toujours plus ferme de l'authenticité de l'écrit que l'Église nous a transmis sous le nom de Jean. Il y a une conviction d'une autre nature qui se forme dans le cœur à la simple lecture d'un pareil livre. Cette conviction ne s'accroît pas ; elle est immédiate, par conséquent complète dès le premier instant. Elle ressemble à la confiance et à l'amour du premier regard, à cette impression décisive à l'intégrité de laquelle trente années de vie commune et de mutuel dévouement n'ajoutent rien.

'L'étude scientifique ne saurait former un semblable lien : ce qu'elle peut faire, c'est uniquement d'écarter les pressions hostiles qui menaceraient de le relâcher ou de le briser. Eh bien, je puis dire que jamais je n'ai senti cette assurance scientifique aussi affermie qu'après ce nouvel examen des preuves sur lesquelles elle repose et des raisons récemment alléguées contre elle.' *Commentaire*, *ut supra*, ed. 3, tom. i. pp. vi and vii.

[1] The *Mittelpartei*, represented by the *Deutsche Evangelische Blätter*, of which he has been editor since 1876.

[2] *Zur Johanneischen Frage*, 1876.

[3] *Das Leben Jesu*, 2 vols. 1885–86.

English Review,[4] which are mainly an examination of Baur's theory as compared with the internal evidences furnished by the Gospel itself. This is the result at which he arrives :—

Result.

> Lastly, it is inconceivable that the Gospel should have been composed in the second century. Not to speak of the great character which is in it, which far exceeds anything that the second Christian century has produced, and which would have left behind no trace and no memory of itself, by name, apart from these writings, the spirit of the century does not harmonize with that of the book. That spirit had already become traditional and ascetic, and it was no longer one that would be stirred by purely religious questions but by strongly theological and ecclesiastical ones. And by them this remarkable book is entirely untinged, yea, it is altogether of another cast. It is an historical monstrosity which the anti-Johannine criticism proposes for our acceptance. But we are compelled to say, on the contrary, that only a previous knowledge of the personality speaking in the Gospel, only the notorious *authority of the eye-witness and apostle*, from the first moment appealing on behalf of the book, could have opened the way for the acceptance and recognition of a Gospel, departing so much from all tradition, and that in an age so careful of tradition, and already in possession of the Synoptists.[5]

Among the later German writers on this subject, I will ask your permission to take the evidence of two.

Zahn, 1838–

One of these is Dr. Theodore Zahn, who is eminent as a writer on many subjects connected with the early history and literature of the Church. He was formerly *privat-docent* at Göttingen and professor at Kiel and Erlangen, and has lately succeeded to the chair at Leipzig vacated by the death of Dr. Lechler. The eminence and learning of Dr. Zahn are placed beyond all question, even by those who differ most from some of his conclusions. Were evidence needed, the edition of the *Epistles of Ignatius and Polycarp*,[6] and the *Investigations for a History of the New Testament Canon and the Ancient Church Literature*,[7] which have appeared at intervals during the last ten years, would more than supply it. And with eminence and learning, there is an individuality and independence which refuses to call any man master, or to think any opinion unquestionable. At length the *History of the New Testament Canon*,[8] for which so much preparatory work had been done, has begun to appear. The first volume is now in our hands, and two more are to follow. We have already the history down to Origen; and though some portions of the arguments await further development in certain promised *Excursuses*, we have enough to show that all the weight of Professor Zahn's general erudition and minute knowledge of the history of the second century, is to be thrown without any hesitation into the scale in favour of the full Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel and its acceptance from the

---

[4] *Contemporary Review*, Oct. and Nov. 1877.

[5] *Ibid.*, *loc. cit.* p. 943.

His independence.

The *History of the Canon.*

The Fourth Gospel.

---

[6] *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera:* Von Gebhardt, Harnack, Zahn, 1876, fasc. ii.

[7] *Forschungen zur Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons und der altkirchlichen Literatur*, 1881, etc.

[8] *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons*, Bd. i. 1888–9.

first. Here, as elsewhere, Dr. Zahn, with characteristic freedom, puts forth some opinions which are peculiar to himself, and will probably remain so ; but on the subject of our present inquiry there is in his view no room for question.

Franke, 1853–

The other German scholar to whose evidence I invite special attention is a young and, in this country, comparatively unknown writer, Dr. August Hermann Franke, formerly a *privat-docent* at Halle, and director of Tholuck's clergy school, but since the publication, in 1885, of the work to which I am about to refer, Professor of Theology at Kiel. This work is entitled *The Old Testament in John*,[9] and, in addition to being a strong vindication of the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel, is specially important in that it approaches the study of the Gospel in the right way, always remembering what the commentators on S. John have but too constantly forgotten, that the Divine subject and the human author were alike Hebrew, both in speech and the circumstances of life, and that the roots of the thought and language must alike be found in the Old Testament.

The *Old Testament in John.*

Scope of work.

Professor Franke commences with the inquiry, What is the attitude of the Gospel to the Old Covenant, its people, its revelation, its writings ?

The second and chief part of the work deals with the Old Testament foundation of the doctrinal conceptions in the Gospel. In some points this is the common Old Testament groundwork which underlies all New Testament doctrine, including the Fourth Gospel. This is illustrated by the doctrines taught concerning God, the world, eschatology, the Messiah. But there is also a specific Johannine type of doctrine, and the essential argument of the book is that the Old Testament lies necessarily at the root of this doctrinal individuality. The proofs are based upon an examination of the following doctrines :—Salvation in Christ as the fulfilment of that given in the Old Testament; the manifestation of God in Jesus Christ; the covenant sacrifice and the atonement; the new commandment; eternal life through communion with God; the new society.

---

[9] *Das alte Testament bei Johannes, ein Beitrag zur Erklärung und Beurtheilung der Johanneischen Schriften.* Göttingen, 1885.

Johannine type of doctrine.

The third division of the work treats of the Old Testament as the basis of the external form of the Johannine writings. The inquiry is here made as to the Johannine use of the words of the Old Testament, the use of the original text and the Septuagint, and the point of view from which John interpreted the Old Testament.

Form of the writing.

The result of this careful and minute examination goes far to prove—even when we have drawn the pen through some more or less fanciful conjectures[1]—that the author of the Fourth Gospel must necessarily have been a Hebrew-speaking Jew of the first century, and

The author a Hebrew-speaking Jew of the first century.

---

[1] Cf. esp. review by Riehm in *Studien und Kritiken*, 1885, pp. 563–582.

in this proof Professor Franke makes a substantial addition to the evidence in favour of the authenticity.

Other writers.

Space would fail me for even a brief enumeration of other modern writers who have been convinced that the Fourth Gospel is really the work of the Apostle whose name it bears, and have felt constrained to offer their evidence in its favour; but the following names, at least, must be added: Olshausen, the Biblical commentator;[2] the brilliant and able, though erratic, Thiersch;[3] Baumgarten-Crusius, the Jena Professor of Theology;[4] Andrews Norton, the American Unitarian divine;[5] our own Greek Testament commentators Alford[6] and Wordsworth;[7] Bishop Alexander,[8] the rock of whose scholarship is none the less solid for being clothed with forms of poetic beauty; Frederick Denison Maurice,[9] expounder of S. John in life and word; Astié,[1] the

---

[2] *Die Aechtheit der vier canonischen Evangelien*, 1823; *Nachweis der Echtheit des Neuen Testaments*, 1832; *Biblische Commentar*, edited after author's death by Ebrard and Wiesinger, 1837-62; *Commentary on the Gospels*, Clark's Library, 1846.

[3] *Versuch zur Herstellung des hist. Standpunkts für die Kritik der N. T. Schriften*, 1845; *Einige Worte über die Aechtheit der N. T. Schriften*, 1846; *Die Kirche in apost. Zeitalter u. die Entstehung der N. T. Schriften*, 1852.

[4] *Theologische Auslegung der Johanneischen Schriften*, 1843. Part II. 1845. Posthumous.

[5] *Genuineness of the Gospels*, 1837–44; ed. 2, 1846: see esp. evidence of Justin and the early Heretics. Cf. Lecture II. p. 63.

[6] *Greek Testament*, 1849–61.

[7] *Greek Testament*, 1856–60, 1872.

[8] Commentary on *Epistles of S. John*, 1881, ed. Canon Cook; and *Epistles of S. John* in the *Expositor's Bible*, 1889.

[9] *Gospel of St. John*, 1857.

[1] *Explication de l'Évangile selon Saint Jean*, 1863–4.

Professor at Lausanne; Tischendorf,[2] known as a textual critic to us all; Thenius,[3] to whom it was the *Gospel of Gospels*; Fisher,[4] Professor at Yale College; Uhlhorn,[5] in various essays, especially the series on Modern Presentation of the Lives of Jesus; Riggenbach,[6] who answers Volkmar, and Van Oosterzee,[7] who answers Scholten; De Pressensé[8] in many works, especially the *Jésus Christ*; Richard Holt Hutton,[9] author of the ablest essay on Baur in the English, perhaps in any language; Schaff,[1] especially in the edition of Lange's *Commentary*, and the *History of the Church*; Milligan,[2] Professor at Aberdeen, in separate essays and in the *Commentary*, where he had the great advantage of Moulton[3] for a co-worker; Liddon[4] and Leathes[5] and Wace,[6] our Bampton Lecturers; McLellan,[7] whose learned work is unhappily but a fragment; Lias[8] and Murphy,[9] whose works on the doctrinal system furnish evidence of high value; Ezra Abbot,[1] whose name has occurred to us already; Charteris,[2] Professor at Edinburgh, and author of a singularly modest and able work on *Canonicity*; Plummer,[3] my own colleague at Durham; Schanz,[4] Professor at Tübingen, and one of the ablest modern commentators of the Roman church; Reynolds,[5] President of Cheshunt College, who has lately contributed an original investigation of striking cogency and freshness; and the Abbé Fillion,[6] whose recent work on the Bible contains a valuable Introduction to the Gospels, and especially to the Gospel according to S. John.

---

[2] *Wann wurden unsere Evangelien verfasst?* 1865–6.

[3] *Das Evangelium der Evangelien*, 1865.

[4] *Essays on Supernatural Origin of Christianity*, 1866; Article in American edition of Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, 1868; *Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief*, 1885.

[5] *Vorträge . . . Lebens Jesu*, 1866.

[6] *Die Zeugnisse*, 1866.

[7] *Das Johannes - Evangelium*, 1867; Eng. Trans. 1869.

[8] *Jésus-Christ, son temps, sa vie, son œuvre*, 1866.

[9] *Theological Essays*, 1871, ed. 3, 1888.

[1] *Lange's Commentary*, 1872, new edition, 1886; and *History of the Christian Church*, New York, 1858, ed. 3, 1886, &c.

[2] *Contemporary Review*, 1867–68–71; *Journal of Sacred Literature*, 1867.

[3] *Popular Commentary on S. John's Gospel*, 1879.

[4] *The Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*, 1866, ed. 13, 1889.

[5] *Witness of St. John to Christ*, 1870; *Religion of the Christ*, 1874.

[6] *The Gospel and its Witnesses*, 1883.

[7] *Four Gospels*, 1875.

Value of their testimony.

This is not merely a list of names: it represents a body of men, differing in nationality, language, church, and creed, but, without an exception, able and careful scholars, who have thought out the problem for themselves. We may not accept all their statements, but their convictions have been formed side by side with, and in full consideration of, the negative criticism of the Gospel; and their combined witness is at once in the strongest degree condemnatory of this criticism, and in the strongest degree confirmatory of the Johannine authorship.

---

[8] *Doctrinal System of St. John*, 1875.

[9] *Scientific Basis of Faith*, 1873.

[1] *External Evidences*, 1880.

[2] *Canonicity*, 1880.

[3] *Greek Testament: St. John*, 1882.

[4] *Commentar*, 1885.

[5] *Pulpit Commentary*: S. John, Introduction, 1888.

[6] *Introduction générale aux Évangiles; Sainte Bible, avec Commentaires*, 1889.

Four English names reserved for special treatment.

Four names are absent from the above list which will occur to all English-speaking students as representing the most trustworthy body of opinion on this subject. I have reserved them for somewhat fuller notice, because I venture to submit that the opinions of Bishop Lightfoot, Bishop Westcott, Dr. Salmon, and Dr. Sanday form in combination a weight of evidence upon this subject which not only overbalances any similar combination, but is in itself absolutely unique.

Character of the witnesses:

I will first ask you to think for a few moments of the witnesses and then of their evidence.

Bishop Lightfoot, 1828–89.

Of Bishop Lightfoot's special qualifications to pronounce an opinion, a careful estimate was published three or four years ago by one of the few men who is thoroughly able to judge :—

> What, it may be asked, are the particular qualities which have won for Bishop Lightfoot so pre-eminent a place, by the universal consent of all competent judges both in England and on the Continent? It is necessary here to weigh our words; for though the impression which Bishop Lightfoot has left upon the public mind is a very distinct one, yet when a comparison is suggested with other illustrious names, it is not enough to use general phrases, and it becomes important to single out special points which are most characteristic and distinctive. I should be disposed to say, then, that the place which Bishop Lightfoot holds was due not only to his possession, but to his very remarkable balance and combination, of a number of distinct excellences—exactness of scholarship, width of erudition, scientific method, sobriety of

judgment, lucidity of style.[7] . . . All through his writings we feel that we have before us the Senior Classic, who was at home in Thucydides and Plato before he was at home in St. Paul; he had shown his skill in many a piece of finished classical composition before he undertook to reproduce the Greek of Polycarp where the Latin only was extant; and it was his practised hand and trained sensitiveness to Greek idiom that made itself felt in his felicitous emendations of Clement and Ignatius. It is here that the Cambridge scholar has the advantage over his German competitors. . . . In reference to exegesis and criticism, I doubt if it is any exaggeration to say that up to the date[8] of his transference to Durham, not a monograph of any importance in England, France, Italy, or Germany seems to have escaped him. . . . His critics may hold different opinions themselves (based very probably in large part upon the materials which Bishop Lightfoot has given them), but I do not remember to have seen or heard of an instance in which he was convicted of what we should call a mistake. . . . We have only to think of the range of his published works to realise what this means.[9] Other writers have had a scientific method, and yet they do not command the same degree of confidence. It is impossible altogether to eliminate the individual element in critical decisions, and the peculiar reliance which is placed in those of Dr. Lightfoot is due to the sense that they have been most carefully and judicially weighed. . . . He never takes up an idea hastily; and if he is slow to give his thoughts expression, they come with all the more weight of maturity when they are expressed.[1]

Bishop Westcott.

Of the scholarship, the knowledge, the thought, the delicate powers of perception and intuition which the present Bishop of Durham has devoted for half a century to the New Testament writings—their contents, their text, and their history—and above all to the writings of S. John, it is unnecessary to remind an English student. Many scholars and thinkers felt what one of their number said, when the Commentary on the Fourth Gospel was published :—

---

[7] Dr. Sanday in the *Expositor*, July 1886, pp. 13, 14.

[8] There was no occasion to fix this limit.

[9] Dr. Sanday, *ut supra*, pp. 18, 19, 20.

[1] *Ibid.* pp. 21, 22.

> To appreciate in any degree the merit of Professor Westcott's work—the fullest, the most finished, the most entirely decisive of its kind, we incline to think, in the whole compass of English theological literature—it is necessary to see what the most advanced position of sceptical criticism actually is, that it may be perceived how quietly and completely it is pulverised by this great master.[2]

Dr. Salmon.

Of the special value of Dr. Salmon's judgment, like testimony from a like competent authority is at hand :—

> Dr. Salmon's 'Historical Introduction to the New Testament' is one of those remarkable books which can only be produced at rare intervals, and of which the importance depends on a singular combination in their subject-matter, their authorship, and the circumstances in which they appear. . . . The name of Dr. Salmon is of European reputation, and the weight it carries is all the greater, because this reputation was originally gained in another field of labour. Dr. Salmon's works have, for many years, been the standard treatises for advanced students in some of the highest branches of modern mathematical science. They still hold their ground, notwithstanding the great progress which has been made in the abstruse subjects of which some of them treat. They have been translated into two or three of the Continental languages, and the eminence they have won was

---

[2] *Church Quarterly Review*, Jan. 1880, p. 329.

marked, not long ago, by the election of their author to the rare distinction of a Member of the French Institute.[3] . . . Considering the prevalent superstitious worship of science and its high priests, it must add to the attention a man can command if he is one of the initiated in this mystery. Dr. Salmon speaks with full authority in this respect, and he is one of the most eminent of the many examples around us, including the present President of the Royal Society, that profound scientific knowledge is fully compatible with a devout faith in the Creed of Christianity. . . . It will be seen, that the real truth is, that the inveterate prejudice is on the part of the chief opponents of Christian tradition. But it is none the less valuable that the truth should be maintained, as in this volume, in a spirit which must impress every fair reader with the scientific calmness of the writer's spirit and method. 'Although,' says the author in his Preface, 'my work may be described as apologetic in the sense that its results agree in the main with the traditional belief of the Church, I can honestly say that I have not worked in the spirit of an advocate anxious to defend a foregone conclusion. I have aimed at making my investigations historical, and at asserting nothing but what the evidence, candidly weighed, seemed to warrant.' The tone, no less than the method, of Dr. Salmon's argument fully sustains this claim, and engages, from the outset, the reader's confidence. One feels oneself in the hands of a quiet and masterly guide, who is only concerned to point out to us the facts with which we have to deal, and who will not press a single conclusion merely because it conforms to his own inclination or presumptions. . . . In discussing any question of criticism, Dr. Salmon writes in just the same manner as if he were investigating a problem in conic sections or the higher algebra.[4]

---

[3] Since these words were written, the high academical distinction of the Provostship of Trinity College, Dublin (1888), and the high scientific distinction of the Copley Medal of the Royal Society (1889) have been conferred on Dr. Salmon.

[4] *Quarterly Review*, Oct. 1886, pp. 460–463.

Dr. Sanday.

Our own Professor of Exegesis has been fewer years before the world than any one of the three with whom he is here grouped; but if a like number of years is given him for his work, a future generation of scholars will probably think him not the least competent of the group to express an authoritative judgment on the present question. It was to the Johannine problem that Dr. Sanday devoted his first published work; and it is this problem which has occupied much of his later studies. He has the peculiar fitness for it which comes from the addition to sound scholarship and an untiring power of taking pains, of a delicately balanced judgment which appreciates the weight of every objection and sympathizes with the feeling of every difficulty. The reader of Dr. Sanday's writings may sometimes think that he carries this sensitiveness to modern objections too far; and that he is too ready to invert the legal maxim and to give the accuser the benefit of the doubt; but the balanced mind which estimates even the trifling weight of a passing theory is never unaffected by the solid weight of historic fact, and the final judgment is definite and clear.

It is the more necessary to invite attention to the really remarkable position of these English divines, because, on the one hand, some continental writers seem to live in unhappy ignorance of them; and, on the other hand, many English students, taking *omne ignotum pro magnifico*, seem to think it necessary to their reputation as scholars, to give ready credence to the last essay which has appeared in a *Zeitschrift*, or, as German is now more commonly known, to the last thesis which has been printed at a Dutch university. They import rushlights from abroad, apparently unaware that they have sunlight at home.

Their position unnoticed by Bleek,

It is very much to the loss of German science, and it is in itself almost incredible, for example, that in a book so full and able, and in most respects thoroughly up to date, as the last edition of Bleek's *Introduction*[5] by Mangold—a work extending to more than a thousand closely-printed pages—there is hardly a reference to any writer of this group. Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians and the Ignatian question are dealt with in 1886 without a reference to Bishop Lightfoot; and the writings of S. John, and the Canon of the New Testament, without a reference to Dr. Westcott!

Weiss,

Weiss's *Introduction* is later still. I have already referred to its excellence. In the preface, printed in English in 1887, the author says:—

> Of actual fellow-workers on the problems of the New Testament I hope I have forgotten none. But I have not been able to follow up foreign literature to any extent.[6]

There is no trace of any acquaintance with a single English writer. Nor is this serious omission amended in the German edition of last year.

Meyer.

Meyer's *Commentary on the Gospel of S. John*[7] has passed through seven German editions, of which the last was issued by Dr. Weiss in 1886. He is apparently quite unaware that Dr. Westcott had published his great work seven years before—though he has 'naturally' referred to the modern English editions of the text—and he explains that he makes no use of the third edition of Godet's *Commentary*, because it had not yet been translated from French into German.[8]

---

[5] Cf. *supra*, p. 314.

[6] Cf. *supra*, pp. 324 sq.

[7] Cf. *supra*, pp. 319 sq.

Their evidence:

But in England at least we know what value to attach to the evidence of these witnesses. I will detain you but a few moments by reference to it.

Bishop Lightfoot's:

And first, the evidence of Bishop Lightfoot. I have already quoted his final opinion, based upon the internal evidences of the Fourth Gospel.[9] This is his view of the external evidences written in 1876, and republished last year :—

The school of S. John in second century.

> We have now reached the close of the second century, and it is not necessary to pursue the history of the School of St. John in their Asiatic home beyond this point. . . . Out of a very extensive literature, by which this school was once represented, the extant remains are miserably few and fragmentary; but the evidence yielded by these meagre relics is decidedly greater, in proportion to their extent, than we had any right to expect. As regards the Fourth Gospel, this is especially the case. If the same amount of written matter—occupying a very few pages in all—were extracted accidentally from the current theological literature of our own day, the chances, unless I am mistaken, would be strongly against our finding so many indications of the use of this Gospel. In every one of the writers, from Polycarp and Papias to Polycrates, we have observed phenomena which bear witness directly or

---

[8] *Op. cit.* 2te Hälfte, p. viii.

[9] Cf. Lecture III. p. 165.

indirectly, and with different degrees of distinctness, to its recognition. It is quite possible for critical ingenuity to find a reason for discrediting each instance in turn. An objector may urge in one case, that the writing itself is a forgery; in a second, that the particular passage is an interpolation; in a third, that the supposed quotation is the original and the language of the Evangelist the copy; in a fourth, that the incident or saying was not deduced from this Gospel but from some apocryphal work, containing a parallel narrative. By a sufficient number of assumptions, which lie beyond the range of verification, the evidence may be set aside. But the early existence and recognition of the Fourth Gospel is the one simple postulate which explains all the facts. The law of gravitation accounts for the various phenomena of motion, the falling of a stone, the jet of a fountain, the orbits of the planets, and so forth. It is quite possible for any one, who is so disposed, to reject this explanation of nature. Provided that he is allowed to postulate a new force for every new fact with which he is confronted, he has nothing to fear. He will then

> 'gird the sphere
> With centric and eccentric scribbled o'er,
> Cycle and epicycle, orb in orb,'

happy in his immunity. But the other theory will prevail nevertheless by reason of its simplicity.[1]

Again :—

Irenæus is the first extant writer in whom, from the nature of his work, we have a right to expect explicit information on the subject of the Canon. Earlier writings, which have been preserved entire, are either epistolary, like the letters of the Apostolic Fathers, where any references to the Canonical books must necessarily be precarious and incidental (to say nothing of the continuance of the oral tradition at this early date as a disturbing element); or devotional, like the Shepherd of Hermas, which is equally devoid of quotations from the Old Testament and from the New; or historical, like the account of the martyrdoms at Vienne and Lyons, where any such allusion is gratuitous; or apologetic, like the great mass of the extant Christian writings of the second century, where the reserve of the writer naturally leads him to be silent about authorities which would carry no weight with the Jewish or heathen writers whom he addressed. But the work of Irenæus is the first controversial treatise addressed to Christians on questions of Christian doctrine, where the appeal lies to Christian documents. And here the testimony to our four Gospels is full and clear and precise.[2]

---

[1] *Contemporary Review*, xxvii. pp. 495–6; *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, 1889, pp. 249 sq.

Bishop Westcott's:

This is the definite witness of Bishop Westcott:—

Internal evidence.

> As far, therefore, as indirect internal evidence is concerned, the conclusion towards which all the lines of inquiry converge remains unshaken, that the fourth Gospel was written by a Palestinian Jew, by an eye-witness, *by the disciple whom Jesus loved*, by John the son of Zebedee.[3]

Again:—

> Three passages (John i. 14; xix. 35; xxi. 24) appear to point directly to the position and person of the author. . . . The general result of the examination of these passages is thus tolerably distinct. The Fourth Gospel claims to be written by an eye-witness, and this claim is attested by those who put the work in circulation.[4]

Again:—

External evidence.

> In considering the external evidence for the authorship of the Fourth Gospel, it is necessary to bear in mind

---

[2] *Contemporary Review* xxviii. pp. 419, 420; *Essays, ut supra*, p. 271.

[3] *The Gospel according to St. John*, ed. of 1886, p. xxv.

[4] *Ibid.* pp. xxv and xxviii.

the conditions under which it must be sought. It is agreed on all hands that the Gospel was written at a late date, towards the close of the first century, when the Evangelic tradition, preserved in complementary forms in the Synoptic Gospels, had gained general currency, and from its wide spread had practically determined the popular view of the life and teaching of the Lord. And further, the substance of the record deals with problems which belong to the life of the Church and to a more fully developed faith. On both grounds references to the contents of this Gospel would naturally be rarer in ordinary literature than references to the contents of the other Gospels. Express citations are made from all about the same time.[5]

Again :—

All evidence points in one direction.

In reviewing these traces of the use of the Gospel in the first three quarters of a century after it was written, we readily admit that they are less distinct and numerous than those might have expected who are unacquainted with the character of the literary remains of the period. But it will be observed that all the evidence points in one direction. There is not, with one questionable exception, any positive indication that doubt was anywhere thrown upon the authenticity of the book. It is possible to explain away in detail this piece of evidence and that, but the acceptance of the book as the work of the Apostle adequately explains all the phenomena without any violence; and hitherto all the new evidence which has come to light has supported this universal belief of the Christian Society, while it has seriously modified the rival theories which have been set up against it.[6]

Dr. Salmon's:

The evidence of Dr. Salmon is not less remarkable :—

Gospel and

I do not think it necessary to spend much time on the proofs that the first Epistle and the Gospel are the work of the same writer. . . . It would be waste of time if I were to enumerate and answer the points of objection to this view made by Davidson and others of his school, whose work seems to me no more than laborious trifling. These microscopic critics forget that it is quite as uncritical to be blind to resemblances as it is to overlook points of difference. . . . I am sure that any unprejudiced judge would decide that while the minute points of difference that have been pointed out between the Gospel and the first Epistle are no more than must be expected in two productions of the same writer, the general resemblance is such, that a man must be devoid of all faculty of critical perception who cannot discern the proofs of common authorship. The main reason for denying the common authorship is that, if it be granted, it demolishes certain theories about St. John's Gospel.[7]

---

[5] *The Gospel, ut supra*, p. xxviii.

[6] *Ibid.* p. xxxii.

First Epistle by same writer.

Again :—

The Fourth Gospel, as I have said, has been the subject of far more serious assaults than the others. If the others are allowed to have been published soon after the destruction of Jerusalem, the fourth is not assigned an earlier date than the latter half of the second century. Such, at least, was Baur's theory; but in the critical sifting it has undergone, the date of the fourth Gospel has been receding further and further back in the second century, so that now hardly any critic with any pretension to fairness puts it later than the very beginning of that century, if not the end of the first century, which comes very close to the date assigned it by those who believe in the Johannine authorship.[8]

Date of Gospel.

Again :—

Now, with respect to external evidence, I have already expressed my belief that John's Gospel stands on quite

External evidence.

---

[7] *Historical Introduction to the New Testament*, ed. 2, 1886, pp. 210, 211.

[8] *Ibid.* p. 213.

as high a level of authority as any of the others. Suffice it now to say that if it be a forgery it has had the most wonderful success ever forgery had: at once received not only by the orthodox, but by the most discordant heretics — by Judaising Christians, Gnostics, Mystics—all of whom owned the necessity of reconciling their speculations with the sayings of this Gospel.[9]

Again :—

Conditions of authorship met only by S. John.

The author of the Fourth Gospel was a Jew.[1] . . . . The writer was a Jew of Palestine.[2] . . . . I regard it, then, as proved that the writer of the fourth Gospel was a Jew, not very distant in time from the events which he relates. Is there, then, any reason why we should refuse credence to the claim, which he himself makes four times, to have been an eye-witness of our Saviour's life (i. 14; xix. 35; xxi. 24; 1 John i. 1)? There is nothing against admitting this claim, but everything in favour of it.[3] . . . . I think we may also conclude that the writer had been a disciple of the Baptist as well as of our Lord.[4] . . . . And no account of the matter seems satisfactory but the traditional one, that the writer was the Apostle John.[5]

Dr. Sanday's.

This is the evidence of Dr. Sanday, taken from his Inaugural Lecture before this University :—

Advance of positive evidence.

It is now some ten years since I published a book (*Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*) on the subject, and in the meantime this question, too, has not stood still. I have already alluded to the remarkable change in the aspect of the external evidence. When I wrote I excused myself from dealing with this on the ground that its results were inconclusive. This could not be said now. Justin, Tatian, the Clementine Homilies, no longer give an uncertain sound. If only the textual argument of which I have spoken holds good—and I have great confidence that it will be found to hold good—then it seems to me that the date of the Gospel is all but demonstrated. As it is, the date assigned to it by some eminent critics has become little less than ludicrous in the light of our fuller knowledge. Baur's 160–170, Volkmar's 155, Scholten's 140, are all dates at which not only is it certain that the Gospel existed, but highly probable that it was already translated, or at least being translated, and that with a text some way advanced on the road of corruption. I am running a little ahead of the proof in asserting this, but not, I suspect, very far. *Dies docebit.* But if the case is made out in all its strength, *a priori* considerations must yield, and the Gospel must take rank as the work of a contemporary, as it professes to be.[6]

---

[9] *Historical Introduction, ut supra*, pp. 215, 216.

[1] *Ibid.* p. 268.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 271.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 275.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 276.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 284.

Internal evidence.

The Gospel of St. John presents an unique phenomenon. It contains two distinct strata of thought, both quite unmistakeable to the critical eye; and in each of these strata, again, there are local peculiarities which complicate the problem. When it comes to be closely investigated, the complexities of the problem are such that the whole of literature probably does not furnish a parallel. The hypothesis of authorship that shall satisfy them thus becomes in its turn equally complicated. It is necessary to find one who shall be at once Jew and Christian, intensely Jewish, and yet comprehensively Christian; brought up on the Old Testament, and yet with a strong tincture of Alexandrian philosophy; using a language in which the Hebrew structure and the Greek superstructure are equally conspicuous; one who had mixed personally in the events, and yet at the time of writing stood at a distance from them; an immediate disciple of Jesus, and yet possessed of so powerful an individuality as to impress the mark of himself upon his recollections; a nature capable of the most ardent and clinging affection, and yet an unsparing denouncer of hostile agencies of any kind which lay outside his own charmed circle. There is one historical figure which seems to fit like a key into all these intricate wards,—the figure of St. John, as it has been handed down to us by a well-authenticated tradition. I can conceive no second. If the St. John of history did not exist, he would have to be invented to account for his Gospel.[7]

---

[6] *An Inaugural Lecture: The Study of the New Testament.* Oxford, 1883, pp. 28, 29.

One key only fits the wards.

Conclusion:

In presenting to you this sketch of modern critical opinions, which, imperfect as it is, must now be brought to a close, I have made no attempt—though in our age it has been not seldom put forward as an excellence—to look at opinions altogether apart from the personality of those who have formed them. I make no claim to be able to estimate testimony without reference to the person who testifies. The author of *Supernatural Religion*, in the Introduction to his *Reply to Dr. Lightfoot's Essays*, adopts the opposite point of view, which he expresses in the following words :—

Personality.

Anonymity.

> I may distinctly say that I have always held that arguments upon very serious subjects should be impersonal, and neither gain weight by the possession of a distinguished name nor lose by the want of it. I leave the Bishop any advantage he has in his throne, and I take my stand upon the basis of reason and not of reputation.[8]

Evidence largely

And 'Testimony,' as Dr. Johnson reminds us, 'is like an arrow shot from a long bow ; the force of it depends on the strength of the hand that draws it.

---

[7] *The Study of the New Testament, ut supra*, p. 32.

[8] *A Reply to Dr. Lightfoot's Essays*, 1889, p. vi.

Argument is like an arrow from a cross-bow, which has equal force though shot by a child.'[9] But history is not chiefly a question of pure reason, and evidence is largely a question of reputation. What we want to know is, not what the very ablest man may from his own point of view conceive that the first and second century ought to have been, but what the first and second century were. And the special value of Bishop Lightfoot's testimony to us is, not that he spoke from the throne of a bishop, but that he spoke as a prince among scholars, placed upon his throne by the universal suffrages of students. It is not that he was the successor of prince-bishops, and himself a prince among bishops, but that he was the humblest and most laborious of students who in singleness of purpose sought the truth with energy which knew not what it was to be weary, with industry which knew not what it was to leave the remotest byways of knowledge unexplored, with anxious care which wiped the very dust from the scales of judgment which he held; who never trusted himself nor asked a reader to trust him, and never bade you take a step with him on a road which was not supported by arches of thought and builded up by buttresses of minute investigations.

a question of reputation.

Of a witness to the first and second century, as to

---

[9] Boswell says that Johnson called this 'a beautiful image in Bacon'; but it is given in the later editions of the *Dictionary*, under *Crossbow*, in a slightly different form, as from Boyle. See Hill, *Boswell's Life of Johnson*, vol. iv. p. 281.

Requisites in a witness:

a witness to any incident, the first requisite is, Was he there? Did he see what took place? Now Bishop Lightfoot, pre-eminently among men who have lived in this century, fulfilled this requisite. He never attempted to write a page before he had investigated the principles and facts which he meant to teach. Starting from highest intellectual and moral gifts, with every advantage of most exact academic training, the early history of the Church became a first aim in all his studies. He essentially went there. To him the persons, the places, the incidents of the first Christian centuries became a living reality. The skeletons of the chroniclers were clothed with the flesh and blood of real persons. He moved among them in the familiar intercourse of old acquaintance. And when he came to testify, he 'testified what he had seen.'[1]

full knowledge,

perfect honesty.

And the second requisite is, absolute honesty. I have read to you some opinions of others on the work of Bishop Lightfoot. Our ears still listen to the echoes of the Church's wailing when he was taken from us. His transparent character is known to us. It is as the brightness of the sun, in the presence of which the earth-born mist of suspicion vanishes away. 'We know that his testimony is true.' Who will think that such testimony is independent of the great personality which stands behind it? I have chosen this personality to illustrate our position because of its acknowledged characteristics, and because I may speak more freely of one who, while in the freshness of memory he is still with us, has in bodily presence been taken from us; but who will not also feel that, while this witness stands in the foremost rank, he is accompanied and followed by others whose personality joins with his, and that these witnesses together with their witness make the positive evidence of this age a strong confirmation of and a substantial addition to that of the centuries which have gone before, and a solid support for that of the centuries which are yet to come?

---

[1] 'The distinction between testimony, argument, and authority may be briefly summed up thus:—

'In questions of testimony, I believe a matter of fact, because the witness believes it.

'In questions of argument, I believe the conclusion to be true, because it is proved by reasons satisfactory to my understanding.

'In questions of authority, I believe a matter of opinion, because it is believed by a person whom I consider a competent judge of the question.' Sir George Cornewall Lewis, *On the Influence of Authority in Opinion*, 1875, p. 18.

At the mouth of two witnesses or three shall every word be established.

In the next lecture it will be my duty to give some account of the results which are to be derived from recent discoveries and other actual additions to our knowledge of our present subject.

LECTURE VII

‘OUR AGE’

RECENT ADDITIONS TO OUR KNOWLEDGE

ΑΡ ΟΥΝ ΛΕΓΟΜΕΝ ΤΙ ΔΟΞΑΝ ΕΙΝΑΙ ;
ΠΩΣ ΓΑΡ ΟΥ ;
ΠΟΤΕΡΟΝ ΑΛΛΗΝ ΔΥΝΑΜΙΝ ΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΗΣ Η ΤΗΝ ΑΥΤΗΝ ;
ΑΛΛΗΝ.
ΕΠ ΑΛΛΩ ΑΡΑ ΤΕΤΑΚΤΑΙ ΔΟΞΑ ΚΑΙ ΕΠ ΑΛΛΩ ΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΗ, ΚΑΤΑ ΤΗΝ [ΑΥΤΗΝ] ΔΥΝΑΜΙΝ ΕΚΑΤΕΡΑ ΤΗΝ ΑΥΤΗΣ.
ΟΥΤΩΣ.

Plato.

LECTURE VII.

Therefore every scribe who hath been made a disciple to the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is a householder, which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old.—Matt. xiii. 52.

Statement of the subject.

'Our age' is remarkable not only for the eminent writers who have given to us the benefit of their thoughts on the authorship of the Fourth Gospel, but also for positive additions to our knowledge of the subject, the first numbers, probably, of an extended series, the results of which no one can estimate.[1] The earth has revealed facts which have for centuries lain concealed beneath its surface. Monasteries and libraries have rewarded the patient investigation of scholars by discoveries of priceless value. Language has furnished its students with the key of hidden treasures. Criticism has, in the hands of its masters, arrived at inductions which must take their place in the domain of established fact.

---

[1] What, for example, would be the effect of the discovery of the complete works of Papias? And we may be near to it. They were perhaps known in the thirteenth or fourteenth centuries, as appears from the following extract :—

'Utinam vero ad nos usque pervenissent illa ! Et supererant quidem sæculo xiii ineunte, ut e codicum MSS. catalogo circa annum Christi 1218 confecto erudimur quem ex ecclesiæ Nemausensis tabulario erutum, cl. Menardus haud ita pridem evulgavit : ut proinde viri eruditissimi recte conjecisse existimantur, quod Trithemii quoque ætate, ut ipsemet innuere videtur, sæculo nimirum xv exeunte, eadem exstitisse potuerint : licet Caveus et Fabricius neutiquam id sibi persuadeant.' *S. Papias Hierapolitanus Episcopus*, Notitia iii. Migne, *Series Græca*, 1857, tom. v. p. 1254.

About the same time there seem to have been four copies of the works of a Papias in the library of the monastery at Canterbury, one of which is described as 'mp̃fectus,' and one has the words 'Luce de Wynchelese' attached. *Bibl. Cotton. Galba*, E. IV. pp. 134 col. 2, 135 col. 2, 137 col. 1, 143 col. 3.

Bernard gives references to two other works of a Papias, one in the Cathedral Library at Worcester, the other in the Library of Robert Burscough. *Catalogi Librorum Manuscriptorum*, 1697.

Width of field.

In entering upon this part of our subject it will at once be seen that a vast field of inquiry is presented to our view, and that we must limit ourselves to a mere reference to large portions of it. We cannot, for example, enter into any details of the interesting work of the *Palestine Exploration Fund*, of that of Mr. Wood in Ephesus, or of Mr. Ramsay in Asia Minor ; we must remind ourselves only of the discoveries of the Codex א, Codex Sangallensis, Codex Tischendorfianus iii., and Codex Holmiensis ; of the Curetonian Syriac ; of the Epistle of Barnabas, of portions of the so-called Homilies of Clement of Rome, and of the *Didache.* But let us do this much at least, for our familiar knowledge may lead us to forget how much additional light has come to us, and is still coming to us, in this ‘ our age.’

Nor ought we to be unmindful how textual criticism in the person of students such as Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Scrivener, Burgon ; and in these later days in the hands of Westcott and Hort, Gregory, Sanday, Wordsworth, and White, has discovered the links by which the text of our present copies of the Gospel is to be traced at least well back into the second century. Nor yet ought we to forget how, in special departments of this field, the labours of the Archbishop Bryennios in the East, of Cardinal Pitra and of Commendatore de Rossi in Rome, of the Abbé Martin in Paris, of Dr. Belsheim in Sweden, of the rising school of textual critics in Holland, of Professors Zahn, Von Gebhardt, and Harnack in Germany, of the American Professors Hall and Warfield, of the Dublin Professors Gwynn and Abbott, of many others whom these names do but represent, are daily increasing the mass of evidence; and how the results all lie in the same direction.

But there are some additions to our knowledge which claim from their immediate connexion with our own subject a fuller, though it must still be a fragmentary, notice.[2]

And in the first place let us consider the importance of a discovery in the practical utilization of which the University of Oxford took considerable part.

M. Villemain's search expedition.

M. Mynoïde Mynas, a Greek scholar in the employ of the French Government, who had been sent out by M. Villemain, the Minister of Public Instruction, on a search expedition among the libraries of the Greek monasteries, brought from Mount Athos in 1842, among other MSS., one of the fourteenth century, containing ten books, which professed to include a Refutation of all Heresies.[3] Among the other treasures which M. Mynas had acquired were a transcript of the long-lost *Fables* of Babrius, a MS. of the *Dialectica* of Galen, and one of the *Gymnastica* of Philostratus;[4] and attention was first naturally directed to these works of more general interest. The MS. treatise to which I am inviting your present thought was not on a very attractive subject, and M. Emmanuel Miller, one of the officers of the Bibliothèque Nationale, in which these treasures had been deposited, described it in 1844 simply as a *Manuscript of the fourteenth century on cotton paper, containing a refutation of all heresies.*[5] The MS. was incomplete, beginning in the middle of the fourth book, but apparently had never contained books i.–iii.; and book x., which is a summary of the work, gives nothing of the contents of books ii.–iv. Further investigation convinced M. Miller that the MS. was part of the *Philosophumena* which had been published by Gronovius and the Benedictine editors as the work of Origen.

---

[2] Cf. generally Lechler's slight but interesting tract, *Urkundenfunde zur Geschichte des christlichen Alterthums*, 1886. I might have been saved some trouble in references, had I met with it before this lecture was in print.

Discoveries by M. Mynas.

The *Philosophumena*

He thereupon proposed to the delegates of the Clarendon Press to undertake the printing and pubedited by M. Miller.

---

[3] *κατὰ πασῶν αἱρέσεων ἔλεγχος.*

[4] Cf. *Rapport adressé à M. le Ministre de l'instruction publique, par M. Mynoïde Mynas, chargé d'une mission en Orient* in the *Revue de Bibliographie Analytique*, 1844, v. pp. 80 sqq.

[5] '*Manuscrit en papier de coton, du XIVe siècle, contenant une réfutation de toutes les hérésies. Cet ouvrage, d'un auteur anonyme, est divisé en dix livres; mais les trois premiers manquent, ainsi que la fin.' Ut supra*, p. 91. Cf. Origen's *Philosophumena; or Refutation of all Heresies*, ed. Miller, Oxford, 1851. Preface, p. v.

lication of the work. His proposal was commended by Dr. Gaisford, to whom he was known as a Greek scholar, and in 1851 the work appeared under the title, *Origen's Philosophumena, or Refutation of all heresies.*[6] The first three books and part of the fourth are wanting, as we have just seen, in the Paris MS.; but M. Miller found it possible to supply the first book from four previously known MSS. in Italian libraries. When attention was once directed to the work, it attracted the notice of scholars far and wide. A striking example of this is found in the fact that an article from the pen of Professor Jacobi, of Berlin, controverting M. Miller's view of the authorship, appeared in the *Methodist Quarterly Review* of New York in October of the same year.[7] From a careful examination of the contents of the work, Professor Jacobi comes to the conclusion that it could not be by Origen, but that it was certainly by a contemporary of Origen. Everything points, in his opinion, to the presbyter Caius, or to Hippolytus. But Caius he remembers was specially distinguished by his opposition to Cerinthus, of whom our author has nothing new to tell us. Caius ascribed the Apocalypse to Cerinthus, our author to the Apostle John; Caius was a strenuous opponent, our author probably an advocate, of sensuous chiliastic views. If the matter of the work is minutely examined, it

Views held by Jacobi,

---

[6] *Origenis Philosophumena sive Omnium Hæresium Refutatio. E Codice Parisino nunc primum edidit Emmanuel Miller.*

[7] *Methodist Quarterly Review,* Oct. 1851, pp. 645–652.

falls in so strikingly with all we know of Hippolytus, as to leave little room for doubt that it was written by him; and it is also known that a work bearing this or a similar title was ascribed to Hippolytus by Eusebius, Jerome, Epiphanius, and Nicephorus, and that on the back of the seat of the statue of Hippolytus, which had been dug up at Portus in 1551, there were the names of writings which our author claims as his own. Professor Jacobi enlarged this article, and republished it in the fuller form in the *German Journal for Christian Knowledge and Christian Life*.[8]

Duncker and Schneidewin,

Meanwhile Dr. Duncker had quite independently ascribed the treatise to Hippolytus in a review of M. Miller's work in the *Göttingen Literary Advertiser*,[9] and undertook to produce an edition of the MS. This he commenced in conjunction with Dr. Schneidewin, but unhappily died before half the work was printed. His colleague completed and published the book in 1859, and their edition became the classical authority.[1]

Bunsen,

Meanwhile also the Baron de Bunsen, who as a statesman and a diplomatist had special interests in the Great Exhibition of 1851, had written to Archdeacon Hare telling him how in the midst of it all, he had been interested in this new discovery of a monument of early Christianity, which he thinks to be the most important made on that ground for a century. His attention had been called to it by Dr. Tregelles, who told him what importance Dr. Routh attached to it, and he accordingly at once sent for the book and examined it for himself. He also came quite independently of other inquirers to the conclusion that it is the work of Hippolytus, and published the results of his investigations at great length.[2]

---

[8] *Deutsche Zeitschrift für christliche Wissenschaft und christliches Leben*, 1851, Nos. 25, 26; 1853, Nos. 24, 25.

[9] *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1851, Stück 152–155. See also the valuable English treatise by Wordsworth, *S. Hippolytus and the Church of Rome*, ed. 2, 1880; and the article by Dr. Salmon, *Hippolytus Romanus*, in Smith and Wace's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, vol. iv. pp. 783–804.

[1] Cf. *Hippolyti Refutatio omnium Hæresium*, ed. Duncker et Schneidewin, Göttingen, 1859.

Lommatzsch,

Dr. Lommatzsch, the editor of *Origen*, had also written to Bunsen to express the opinion that the work could not be attributed to Origen, and that in his opinion it was the work of Hippolytus.

Von Döllinger,

Dr. von Döllinger followed in 1853,[3] admitting that the treatise is by Hippolytus, but seeking to prove from the character of the work that the author must have been a schismatic and an anti-pope.

Cruice,

The Abbé Cruice felt convinced that the work was not written by Hippolytus, and in the valuable *Introduction* to his edition of it, arrives at the hesitating result that it is a 'work ascribed to Origen.'[4]

Baur and

Baur was of opinion that the work was by Caius,

---

[2] *Hippolytus and his Age*, 1852, 4 vols., esp. *Five Letters to Archdeacon Hare*, vol. i.; *Christianity and Mankind*, 1854, 7 vols.

[3] *Hippolytus und Kallistus*, 1853, Eng. Trans. Plummer, 1876.

[4] *Études sur des . . . . Philosophumena*, 1853: *Histoire de l'Église de Rome*, 1856; and esp. *Philosophumena, sive Hæresium omnium Confutatio, opus Origeni adscriptum*, Paris, 1860.

Fessler.

and was supported by Fessler, from the opposite Tübingen camp,[5] but he has now no following in this view, and indeed seems himself to have abandoned it.[6]

Consensus of opinion in favour of Hippolytus.

Ritschl, Volkmar, Overbeck, and, with the exception of Lipsius (who is still doubtful, and quotes the work as pseudo-Origen), almost every authority of first importance now accepts the view that the discovery of Mynoïde Mynas has really placed in our hands an original work of Hippolytus which dates from the first quarter of the third century.

Importance of the discovery.

The interest and importance of the work, which this University had the honour of giving to the world, have not been overrated. Now for the first time we hear of Justin the Gnostic ; now we know something more than the names of Monoimus, and of the Peratici ; now we have a much fuller treatment than before of the doctrines of Simon Magus and the Simonians. Now for the first time in the history of Gnosticism there was presented a theory not of dualism, but of pantheistic monism, not of emanation from the higher to the lower, but of evolution from the lower to the higher. The position of Basilides at the beginning of the second century, as disclosed in this work, which was unknown in modern times until it was issued by the Clarendon Press of this

---

[5] *Theologische Quartalschrift*, 1852, ii. pp. 299 sqq. ; *Theologische Jahrbücher*, 1853, Heft 1, 3, and 1854, Heft 3.

[6] *Christenthum und christliche Kirche der drei ersten Jahrhunderte*, 2te Aufl. 1860, p. 344.

University less than forty years ago, reminds more than one of its exponents[7] of the position of Hegel in the nineteenth century.

Which is the true Basilides?

The question naturally arose, and was eagerly discussed:—Is this the true Basilides? Are we to accept the statements of Hippolytus as representing the founder of the school, or have they been influenced by the teaching of later disciples? It is of course just possible that the explanation of the difference between this new picture and the features previously known to us, is to be found in an exoteric and esoteric doctrine, or that Hippolytus presents the doctrine in an earlier, and Irenæus in a later stage of the development, both being alike representations of the personal Basilides. But most thinkers have felt that they must choose between the old and the new; and whether we count names, or weigh them, a strong preponderance of the best critical opinion is in favour of the view that we have in the pages of Hippolytus a faithful representation of the original work of Basilides himself. This deduction is based upon an examination of the passages in Hippolytus, and a comparison of them with the portions of the *Exegetica* of Basilides which are known to be preserved in Clement of Alexandria; and this view has been accepted by, among others, Jacobi,[8]

Critics generally prefer Hippolytus.

---

[7] Mansel, *Gnostic Heresies*, 1875, edited by Bishop Lightfoot, p. 147; Schaff, *History of the Church*, vol. ii. p. 453.

[8] *Basilidis philosophi gnostici sententias ex Hippolyti libro κατὰ πασῶν αἰρέσεων nuper reperto illustravit* 1852, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 1876-7, i. pp. 481 sq.

Baur,[9] Uhlhorn,[1] by Gundert, though he thinks that there is a dualistic principle in the Hippolytean account,[2] and by Möller.[3] On the other side, Hilgenfeld prided himself on being the first to oppose this view, and has remained consistent in his convictions.[4] He has been followed by Lipsius, whose opinion is of great weight, but who has taken an exceptional line on the whole of the Hippolytean question;[5] by Volkmar,[6] and by Scholten.[7] In our own country the prevailing opinion that Hippolytus represents the original Basilides has been maintained in a lecture delivered before this University by the late Dean Mansel, as Professor of Ecclesiastical History,[8] and in an article by the Cambridge Professor, Dr. Hort, which leaves little room for any further investigation into our present material for knowing

Exceptions.

Opinions

---

[9] *Christenthum und christliche Kirche, ut supra*, 1te Aufl. 1853, pp. 187 sqq.; 2te Aufl. 1860, pp. 204 sqq.

[1] *Das Basilidianische System mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Angaben des Hippolytus*, 1855.

[2] *Das System des Gnostikers Basilides* in *Zeitschrift für lutherische Theologie und Kirche*, 1855, pp. 209–220; and 1856, pp. 37–54.

[3] *Geschichte der Kosmologie in der griechischen Kirche bis auf Origenes*, 1860, pp. 344 sqq.; *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1862, iv. pp. 452 sqq.; and *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 1877–78, ii. pp. 422 sqq.

[4] *Theologische Jahrbücher*, 1856, i.; *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1862, pp. 400 sqq., and especially 1878, pp. 228 sqq.

[5] *Der Gnosticismus, sein Wesen, Ursprung und Entwickelungsgang*, 1860, pp. 101 sqq.; *Zur Quellenkritik des Epiphanios*, 1866, pp. 101 sqq.; *Die Quellen der ältesten Ketzergeschichte*, 1875, pp. 118 sqq.

[6] *Hippolytus und die römischen Zeitgenossen*, 1855; *Ursprung unserer Evangelien*, 1866, pp. 70 sqq.

[7] *Oudste Getuigenissen*, 1866, pp. 69 sqq.

[8] Mansel, *Gnostic Heresies*, 1875, *ut supra*, pp. 144–165.

of Dr. Hort,

the whole position of Basilides. Dr. Hort's inquiries lead him to conclude that—

> The freshness and power of the whole section, wherever we touch the actual words of the author, strongly confirm the impression that he was no other than Basilides himself. Thus we are led independently to the conclusion suggested by the correspondence with the information of Clement, whom we know to have drawn from the fountain-head, the *Exegetica*. . . . We shall therefore assume that the eight chapters of Hippolytus (vii. 20–27) represent faithfully though imperfectly the contents of part at least of the *Exegetica* of Basilides. . . .[9]

and M. Renan.

M. Renan reached a similar conclusion quite independently, but having done so he is naturally more positive :—

> The author of the Philosophumena has without doubt made this analysis from the original works of Basilides.[1]

This conclusion independent of any view of the Fourth Gospel.

This judgment has been arrived at, and is now generally held by critics of all schools of opinion, quite apart from any theory as to the Fourth Gospel. It is the result of an investigation into the sources of our knowledge of Gnosticism, arising out of the discovery and publication of the *Philosophumena*.[2]

---

[9] Art. *Basilides* in Smith and Wace's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, vol. i. p. 271.

[1] 'L'auteur des *Philosophumena* a sans doute fait cette analyse sur les ouvrages originaux de Basilide.' *L'Église Chrétienne*, 1879, p. 158, note.

[2] It is worthy of special remark that the reading which is given by all the editors in the opening sentence of this section is, as they themselves note, in opposition to the Parisian Codex, which is their sole authority. They read : *Βασιλείδης τοίνυν καὶ Ἰσίδωρος, ὁ Βασιλείδου παῖς γνήσιος καὶ μαθητὴς, φασὶν εἰρηκέναι Ματθίαν* . . . . (Duncker et Schneidewin : Cruice. Miller makes the ob-

But when we come to read these eight chapters, which with great probability, not to say 'without doubt,' represent faithfully a work of Basilides, we meet with two passages which are—I think we may now say 'without doubt'—verbal quotations from the Fourth Gospel.

But this Basilides contains clear quotations from the Gospel.

Meaning of φησίν.

The first of these quotations occurs in the twenty-second chapter of the seventh book, which is upon 'the origin of the world and upon sonship.' In the earlier part of the chapter there has been a definite mention of Basilides, and this is followed by a series of references in the singular number, 'he says.'[3] In the midst of the series there is one plural reference to the school generally, 'as these men say.'[4] Then the singular recurs, and is followed until the definite quotation, 'And this, he says, is that which is spoken of in the Gospels,'

He was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.[5]

---

vious mistake of correcting Ματθίαν, which he gives as the reading of the Codex, into Ματθαῖον. All read φασὶν; all give the MS. reading φησίν.) Taken in connexion with the contents of the section, and the remarkable use of the word φησίν, it is probable that the singular is to be preferred as indicating that the teaching is that of Basilides, in which the son played only a subsidiary part. They are, as teachers, one person, not two. Cf. P. Hofstede de Groot, *Basilides*, Deutsche Ausgabe, 1868, p. 4.

[3] φησίν.

[4] ὡς λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνδρες οὗτοι.

[5] Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἦν ἄπορον εἰπεῖν προβολήν τινα τοῦ μὴ ὄντος θεοῦ γεγονέναι τι οὐκ ὄν,—φεύγει γὰρ πάνυ καὶ δέδοικε τὰς κατὰ προβολὴν τῶν γεγονότων οὐσίας ὁ Βασιλείδης—ποίας γὰρ προβολῆς χρεία, ἢ ποίας ὕλης ὑπόθεσις, ἵνα κόσμον θεὸς ἐργάσηται, καθάπερ ὁ ἀράχνης τὰ μηρύματα, ἢ θνητὸς ἄνθρωπος χαλκὸν ἢ ξύλον ἤ τι τῶν τῆς ὕλης μερῶν ἐργαζόμενος

The second quotation occurs in the twenty-seventh chapter of the same book, which deals with 'the destiny of the creature,' where, in the midst of a series of references in the third person singular, 'he says,'[6] we read :—

> Now that each has its own seasons (he says), the Saviour is sufficient proof when he asserts 'Mine hour is not yet come.'[7]

That Hippolytus here represents some one as quoting the Fourth Gospel is admitted on all sides ; it is indeed quite impossible to deny it. I confess that I

λαμβάνει ; Ἀλλὰ εἶπε, φησί, καὶ ἐγένετο, καὶ τοῦτό ἐστιν, ὡς λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνδρες οὗτοι, τὸ λεχθὲν ὑπὸ Μωσέως· Γενηθήτω φῶς, καὶ ἐγένετο φῶς. Πόθεν, φησί, γέγονε τὸ φῶς; ἐξ οὐδενός· οὐ γὰρ γέγραπται, φησί, πόθεν, ἀλλ' αὐτὸ μόνον ἐκ τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ λέγοντος, ὁ δὲ λέγων, φησίν, οὐκ ἦν, οὐδὲ τὸ γενόμενον ἦν. Γέγονε, φησίν, ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων τὸ σπέρμα τοῦ κόσμου, ὁ λόγος ὁ λεχθείς· γενηθήτω φῶς, καὶ τοῦτο, φησίν, ἔστι τὸ λεγόμενον ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις· Ἦν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν, ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον. *Hippolyti Refutatio omnium Hæresium*, vii. 22. Ed. Duncker et Schneidewin, p. 360.

Ἦν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον.—John i. 9.

[6] φησίν.

[7] Ὅτι δὲ, φησίν, ἕκαστον ἰδίους ἔχει καιρούς, ἱκανὸς ὁ σωτὴρ λέγων· Οὔπω ἥκει ἡ ὥρα μου, καὶ οἱ μάγοι τὸν ἀστέρα τεθεαμένοι· ἦν γὰρ, φησί, καὶ αὐτὸς ὑπὸ γένεσιν ἀστέρων καὶ ὡρῶν ἀποκαταστάσεως ἐν τῷ μεγάλῳ προλελογισμένος σωρῷ. *Ibid*. vii. 27, p. 376.

Καὶ λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, γύναι ; οὔπω ἥκει ἡ ὥρα μου.—John ii. 4.

should have thought it to be also impossible to deny that Basilides is himself here referred to, were it not that it has been denied. I know not who else in the whole school stood out so prominently that he could be referred to for an *ipse dixit.* For the purposes of our present inquiry it is not indeed of primary importance to ascertain whether this is the language of Basilides or of a disciple who represents him. If the disciple accepted the Gospel, he did so because the master had done so before him. But as a matter of literary criticism I invite you to a perusal of the context of the passages. They are now easily within reach, and I submit that the natural, nay, more, the only reasonable interpretation of the whole is, that we are here reading the words of the founder of the school. We saw but just now that, as a question of history and philosophy, and quite apart from any inquiry about the Fourth Gospel, a remarkable consensus of critical opinion had expressed itself in favour of the view that these chapters come from the original Basilides. A certainly not less remarkable consensus of opinion, regarding the question now as one of the Fourth Gospel—you will of course see how the separate lines of investigation support each other—may be alleged in favour of the view that Basilides is quoting S. John.

Critical opinions:

Bunsen's,

Baron de Bunsen, to whose investigations of Hippolytus we have referred, states in the preface to his work :—

> We have here, amongst others, quotations from the Gospel

of St. John by Basilides, who flourished in the beginning of the reign of Hadrian, or about the year 117; furnishing a conclusive answer to the unfortunate hypothesis of Strauss, and the whole school of Tübingen, that the fourth Gospel was written about the year 165 or 170.[8]

Keim's,

Dr. Keim says—I quote from the English translation of the *Jesu von Nazara*:—

> In the first place, it is certain that the *Philosophoumena* repeatedly and distinctly introduce the Johannine quotations of Basilides, and of no other; 'he says' and not 'they say,' as it would have been were the writer quoting Isidore and the chorus of successors: and if the possibility of some confusion is admitted—though the evidence of such confusion is weak—yet the fact remains sufficiently clear that the fourth Gospel actually existed in the time of Basilides, and that the Gnostics—masters and scholars—eagerly laid hold of the book.[9]

On a question which is much more one of literary perception than of theological learning, you will attach very high importance to the opinions of M. Renan and of Mr. Matthew Arnold.

M. Renan's,

M. Renan says without hesitation:—

> Basilides makes use of the New Testament for the most

---

[8] *Hippolytus*, *ut supra*, ed. 1852, vol. i. p. v.

[9] 'Im Voraus ist hier sicher, dass jene Schrift wiederholt bestimmt die johanneischen Citate des Basilides einführt und keines Andern, "er sagt" und nicht "sie sagen," etwa Isidor und der folgende Chor; und mag man die Möglichkeit einer Verwechslung vorbehalten, sosehr der Aufweis des Rechtes schwächlich ist, so fällt die Thatsache genugsam in's Gewicht, dass Johannes zur Zeit des Basilides wirklich existirte und dass die Gnosis nachweislich in den Meistern und Schülern sein Buch eifrig ergriff.' *Jesu von Nazara*, 1867, vol. i. p. 144; Eng. Trans., 1876, vol. i. p. 196.

part in accord with the general consent, excluding certain books, especially the Epistles to the Hebrews, to Titus, to Timothy, but admitting the Gospel of John.[1]

Mr. Arnold's.

Mr. Arnold is not less certain :—

> Now it is true that the author of the *Philosophumena* sometimes mixes up the opinions of the master of a school with those of his followers, so that it is difficult to distinguish between them. But if we take all doubtful cases of the kind and compare them with our present case, we shall find that it is not one of them. It is not true that here, where the name of Basileides has come just before, and where no mention of his son or of his disciples has intervened since, there is any such ambiguity as is found in other cases. It is not true that the author of the *Philosophumena* habitually wields the *subjectless he says* in the random manner alleged, with no other formula for quotation both from the master and from the followers. In general, he uses the formula *according to them* (*κατ' αὐτούς*) when he quotes from the school, and the formula *he says* (*φησί*) when he gives the dicta of the master. And in this particular case he manifestly quotes the dicta of Basileides, and no one who had not a theory to serve would ever dream of doubting it. Basileides, therefore, about the year 125 of our era, had before him the Fourth Gospel.[2]

Mr. Arnold follows the author of the *Philosophumena* to an earlier stage in Gnostic development in the East, and finds the predecessors of Basilides in the Naaseni or Ophites[3] and the Peratæ. These are his words :—

---

[1] 'Il se servait du Nouveau Testament, tel à peu près que le consentement général l'avait fait, excluant certains livres, en particulier les Épîtres aux Hébreux, à Tite, à Timothée, admettant l'Évangile de Jean.' *L'Église Chrétienne*, 1879, p. 162.

[2] *God and the Bible*, 1875, pp. 268 sqq.

> So we must take the Naaseni and the Peratæ, whom the author of *Supernatural Religion* dismisses in a line as 'obscure sects towards the end of the second century,' we must take them as even earlier than Basileides and the year 125.

Mr. Arnold continues :—

> These sects we find repeatedly using, in illustration of their doctrines, the Fourth Gospel. We do not say that they use it as John's, or as a canonical Scripture. But they give sayings of Jesus which we have in the Fourth Gospel and in no other, and they give passages from the author's own prologue to the Fourth Gospel.[4]

The Clementine Homilies.

I have had occasion in a previous lecture to refer to the Clementine Homilies and to the fact that they are connected with an interesting modern discovery.[5] Our earliest knowledge of this work comes from Turrianus, who in his treatise on the Apostolic Canons in the sixteenth century[6] made use of a MS. of the Homilies which is not now known. They were printed by Cotelier in his edition of the Apostolic Fathers of 1672, from one of the Colbertine MSS. in the Library at Paris. The manuscript was, however, both defective—breaking off in the middle of the nineteenth Homily—and manifestly corrupt. Clericus published three editions, 1698, 1700, 1724, but without any fresh MS. authority. Schwegler published an edition of the work in 1847, which did not add much to what had gone before. Meanwhile, in 1837, Dr. Albert Dressel had observed, in the Ottobonian Library at the Vatican, a MS. of the early part of the fourteenth century which contained the hitherto unknown portion of the Homilies. From defect of eyesight caused by unskilful treatment, and by pressure of work which he thought more important, he was obliged to postpone the publication of his proposed edition of the MS. A further delay was caused by the scarcity of modern books in Rome. At length the work was published in Göttingen in 1853.[7] Now the sixteen years during which this MS. was known to Dr. Dressel, but not yet published, were the most vigorous years of the Tübingen school. The denial that the Fourth Gospel was quoted in the Clementines was necessary to the position of the school, and the denial was made both by Baur and by his followers, Zeller, Schwegler, and Hilgenfeld;[8] but here was a MS., the authenticity of which could not be denied, and it contained a quotation the source of which could not be questioned. Hilgenfeld and Volkmar at once admitted, in Baur and Zeller's *Year-book*, that this was undoubted; and Hilgenfeld called attention to the changed position in various subsequent works.[9]

---

[3] Cf. esp. Hönig, *Die Ophiten*, 1890.

[4] *God and the Bible*, 1884, p. 155.

[5] Lecture II. pp. 83 sq.

[6] *Defensio pro Canonibus Apostolorum et Epistolis Pontificum*, Lutetiæ, 1573.

Dressel's discovery, 1837–53.

Quotation now admitted

---

[7] *Clementis Romani . . . Homiliæ Viginti* . . . 1853.

[8] Baur, *Kritische Untersuchungen*, etc., 1847, p. 576.

[9] *Theologische Jahrbücher*, 1854, pp. 446–7 and 534. Cf. especially Hilgenfeld, *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Evangelien Justin's der clementinischen Homilien und Marcion's*, 1850, with his *Evange-*

on all sides.

There was no ground for discussion upon this point now left. On all hands the reference to the Fourth Gospel was admitted, and by no one more frankly than by Strauss in the *Life of Jesus for the German People*, which was published in 1864.[1]

Zeller's unfortunate assertion.

Zeller was particularly unfortunate in his assertions, for he published in the *Tübingen Year-book* an article upon the *Citations from the Fourth Gospel in the Refutation of All Heresies*, in which he declares that it is in vain men seek for any knowledge of the Fourth Gospel in the Clementine Homilies.[2] This article was published in the year 1853, in Tübingen, and at that moment Dressel's new discovery, which was to establish that knowledge beyond question, must have been already in type at Göttingen.

Tatian's

Another remarkable story of discovery in our own time is connected with the *Diatessaron* of Tatian,[3]

---

lien, 1854, p. 346, and his note in the *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 1875, p. 43. Cf. also reference to position of author of *Supernatural Religion* in Lecture II. p. 84.

[1] 'In dem erst kürzlich aufgefundenen Schlusse der clementinischen Homilien ist unläugbar die Geschichte vom Blindgeborenen, Joh. 9, berücksichtigt, vielleicht auch an einer andern Stelle, Joh. 10, 3.' *Das Leben Jesu*, 1864, p. 69.

[2] 'Die clementinischen Homilien, deren Bekanntschaft mit Johannes man vergeblich darzuthun sucht.' *Theologische Jahrbücher*, 1853, p. 145.

[3] Cf. Lightfoot, *Contemporary Review*, May 1877, and *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, 1889; Ezra Abbot, *The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, 1880; Adolf Harnack, *Texte und Untersuchungen*, Bd. i. Heft 1, and art. *Tatian* in *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 1888, xxiii. p. 80; Möller, art. *Tatian* in Herzog-Plitt, *Real-Encyklopädie* xv. p. 208; Fuller, art. *Tatian* in Smith and Wace's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, vol. iv. p. 783; Hemphill, *Diatessaron*, 1888.

Diatessaron.

the pupil of Justin. A dozen years ago when public attention was much excited by the appearance of the work entitled *Supernatural Religion*, and by some wise and many unwise reviews of it and replies to it, one of the questions to which special thought was directed was the old dispute of the critics whether this *Diatessaron*, or Harmony of the Four Gospels, which was known to have been composed by Tatian, did or did not include the Fourth Gospel. That the pupil of Justin Martyr was acquainted with the Gospel was clear enough from his *Apology*;[4] but how different would the position be could it be fully established that he had or had not received and handed on, as a sacred writing of the Church, the Gospel according to S. John. And at that time no one of the disputants seems to have had the least idea that the key to this lock was not only close at hand, but had been discovered, and was waiting to be used. It had been for some years on Bishop Lightfoot's bookshelves, as he himself tells us; but it was in Armenian, and he had not then the means of sifting the four volumes which contained it.[5] The learned Dr. Lipsius of Jena does not seem to have been aware, when he wrote the article on *Apocryphal Gospels* for the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, that the Armenian version of the *Diatessaron* had been published.[6] Dean Payne Smith, one of the few English scholars

The modern discovery.

---

[4] *Oratio ad Græcos*, capp. iv. v. xiii. xix., ed. von Otto, *Corpus Apologetarum*, tom. vi. pp. 18, 20, 22, 60, 88.

[5] *Essays, ut supra*, 1889, p. 278.

[6] Smith and Wace's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, vol. ii. p. 713, col. 2.

who could have read it, must have had it in his hands when he wrote for the same work the article *Ephraim the Syrian*, for he refers to the commentary on S. Paul's Epistles in the third volume of the Armenian translation of Ephrem's works,[7] and the translation of the *Diatessaron* was lying unnoticed in the second volume all the while. Bishop Lightfoot's article was published in May 1877,[8] and the volume of the *Dictionary of Christian Biography* which contains the articles by Dean Payne Smith and Dr. Lipsius was published in 1880. And yet the Armenian translation of the works of Ephrem had been published by the Mechitarist monks as long ago as 1836, this Armenian translation had been noticed by Dr. de Lagarde in 1862, and at the very moment when all this discussion was taking place, had already been issued in a Latin translation from the press at Venice.

The history of the *Diatessaron* is long, and our time is short. The story has often been told during the last ten years, and there is no need for me to tell it with any fulness again. The chief facts will sufficiently illustrate the importance of this recent addition to our knowledge.

Reference to the work

Now, in the first place, it was known from Eusebius that Tatian had composed a Harmony of the Four Gospels which he called a *Diatessaron*, though it is not clearly established that Eusebius by Eusebius,

---

[7] *Dictionary, ut supra*, p. 141, col. 1.

[8] *Contemporary Review*, May 1877.

had any personal acquaintance with the work. His language seems, indeed, to imply that he was speaking of a commonly known matter of fact :—

> But their chief and founder Tatian formed a sort of connexion and compilation of the Gospels, I know not how, which he called the *Diatessaron.* This work is current in some quarters (with some persons) even now.[9]

and Epiphanius.

Epiphanius tells us how, after the martyrdom of Justin, Tatian went to the East and fell into all sorts of errors, and adds :—

> The Diatessaron Gospel is said to have been composed by him, but some persons call it the Gospel according to the Hebrews.[1]

That is, Epiphanius himself knows nothing about it, and gives two reports which were current in his time. The second of these reports is a natural mistake of people who had heard of this Gospel in the region of Edessa, and of the Gospel of the Hebrews in the region of Aleppo, and understanding the language of neither, knowing only that they were both Oriental and both supposed to be heretical, took them to be the same. When he comes to speak in his own person of the Gospel according to the Hebrews he, as other Catholic writers, follows the Ebionites in connecting it with the Gospel according to S. Matthew.[2] Beyond these notices in Eusebius and Epiphanius, we do not meet the *Diatessaron* on purely Greek ground, and these writers only prove that it was unknown in the Greek church.

---

[9] Ὁ μέντοι γε πρότερος αὐτῶν ἀρχηγὸς ὁ Τατιανὸς συνάφειάν τινα καὶ συναγωγὴν οὐκ οἶδ᾽ ὅπως τῶν εὐαγγελίων συνθεὶς τὸ ‘Διὰ Τεσσάρων’ τοῦτο προσωνόμασεν· ὃ καὶ παρά τισιν εἰσέτι νῦν φέρεται. *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 29. See especially Bishop Lightfoot's note on οὐκ οἶδ᾽ ὅπως, *op. cit.* p. 278 : and Hemphill, *Diatessaron, ut supra.* Introd. p. xiv.

[1] Λέγεται δὲ τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων εὐαγγέλιον (Scaliger text, εὐαγγελίων) ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ γεγενῆσθαι ὅπερ, Κατὰ Ἑβραίους τινὲς καλοῦσι. *Hær.* xlvi. 1 ; ed. Oehler, *Corpus,* tom. ii. p. 710.

Not known in Western Church.

In the Western Church it is unnoticed under circumstances which make it practically certain that it was unknown until the time of Victor, bishop of Capua, in the sixth century, a name which will be remembered from its connexion with the *Codex Fuldensis*, and with a work on the Paschal Cycle. Victor found a Latin compilation of the four Gospels without any name or indication of authorship, and he was led by the passage of Eusebius, to which I have referred, to think it must be the same as the work by Tatian. His identification was not accepted by scholars, and as late as Dr. Ernest Ranke's edition of the *Codex Fuldensis*,[3] it was generally thought that he had made a mistake. To this point we must presently return.

Known in Syrian Church.

This ignorance of the *Diatessaron* in the Greek and Latin churches confirms the impression which is on every ground probable, that Tatian's *Diatessaron* was written in Syriac and for the use of Syriac-speaking churches.[4] And when we come upon

Written in Syriac.

---

[2] *Hær.* xxviii. 5; xxx. 3, 13, 14; ed. Oehler, tom. ii. pp. 222, 246, 262, 264.

[3] *Codex Fuldensis. Novum Testamentum Latine interprete Hieronymo ex Manuscripto Victoris Capuani*, 1868. Cf. *Evangeliorum quatuor Harmonia, Tatiano Alexandrino authore in Orthodoxographa Patrum Monum.* Basileæ, 1855, pp. 116 sqq.

[4] This view is accepted by Bishop Lightfoot, Zahn, and Hilgenfeld, and now by De Lagarde and Bäthgen. Cf. Fuller, art. *Tatian*, *ut supra*, p. 801 col. 1;

Oriental ground we at once meet with it. The erudition of the late Dr. William Wright has given good reason for believing—and Zahn and Lipsius are agreed in believing—that the quotations in the

Homilies of Aphrahat.

Homilies by the Persian sage and bishop, Aphraates, or more accurately Aphrahat, who flourished in the middle of the fourth century, are made from this Harmony;[5] and Zahn's views are accepted fully, perhaps too fully, by Dr. Georg Bert in a German translation of the *Homilies* which has recently appeared.[6]

Doctrine of Addai.

This is further confirmed by the *Doctrine of Addai*, an apocryphal Syrian work, which is assigned with much probability to the middle of the third century, and which professes to give an account of the church at Edessa. The people are described as coming together 'to the prayers of the service, and to [the reading of] the Old Testament and the *New of the Diatessaron*.'[7]

Theodoret.

The widespread use of the *Diatessaron* in the Catholic churches of the East in the first half of the fifth century is illustrated by Theodoret, bishop of

---

Wordsworth, *Church History to the Council of Nicæa*, ed. 4, 1889, p. 482, note by J(ohn) S(arum); and especially the interesting note in Hemphill, *Diatessaron*, App. A, pp. 53–4.

[5] Wright, *Homilies of Aphraates* (Syriac), vol. i. 1869. Cf. especially Zahn, *Forschungen*, 1881, vol. i. pp. 72–89.

[6] Bert, *Aphrahats des persischen Weisen Homilien aus dem Syrischen übersetzt und erläutert.* Von Gebhardt u. Harnack, *Texte u. Untersuchungen*, 1888, Bd. iii. Heft 3 and 4.

[7] Cureton, *Ancient Syriac Documents*, 1864, p. 15; Phillips, *The Doctrine of Addai*, 1876, p. 34 and note. On the text, see note in Ezra Abbot, *Authorship*, *ut supra*, p. 53.

Cyrrhus, near the Euphrates, from A.D. 420 or 423 to A.D. 457 or 458, who testifies that 'Tatian composed the Gospel which is called *Diatessaron*,' and tells us how he found more than two hundred copies in use and put them away, and introduced in their place the Gospels of the four Evangelists.[8]

Bar-Salîbî.

Our next firm ground is reached only after a considerable leap. Dionysius Bar-Salîbî, an Armenian bishop of the twelfth century, speaks of a Commentary which was written on the *Diatessaron* by the well-known Syrian Father, Ephraim of Edessa. His statement[9] distinguishes the *Diatessaron* of Tatian from a Harmony by Ammonius—the two works being wholly different in arrangement—and says that it began with 'In the beginning was the Word.' He also speaks of a third and later *Diatessaron* composed by Elias of Salamia, who could not find the work of Ammonius and constructed one to supply its place. He himself quotes the works of Tatian and Ammonius in the same passage of his Commentary, making their distinctness absolute.[1]

The Mechitarist

In the year 1836 the Mechitarist Fathers of the

---

[8] *Καὶ τὰ τῶν τεττάρων εὐαγγελιστῶν ἀντεισήγαγον Εὐαγγέλια.*—*Hæreticarum Fabularum Compendium*, i. cap. 20 ; ed. Migne, iv. p. 372.

[9] Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, i. p. 57 ; ii. pp. 159 sq.

[1] 'Præter Ephræmum verò, Chrysostomum, Cyrillum, Mosen Barcepham, et Joannem Darensem, quibus Bar-Salibæum usum fuisse suprà dixi, auctores hi ab ipso citantur : videlicet, *Dionysius* epist. ad Timotheum, fol. 262. *Clemens* epist. adversus eos, qui matrimonium rejiciunt, fol. 155. *Ammonii*, et *Tatiani* Diatessaron, fol. 30.' *Ibid.* ii. p. 158 ; cf. Bishop Lightfoot, *Essays*, 1889, *ut supra*, pp. 280 sq. ; Hilgenfeld, *Einleitung*, p. 77.

Fathers.

Monastery of San Lazaro, in Venice, published the collected works of Ephraim in Armenian, in four octavo volumes, the second of which contained this Commentary on Tatian's *Diatessaron*, from an Armenian version of the fifth century. The work naturally attracted little attention, the Armenian language being hardly known in Western Europe; but Father Aucher, one of the monks of San Lazaro, made a literal Latin translation, which he placed in the hands of Dr. Mösinger, Professor of Biblical Criticism, at Salzburg, who compared it with one of the Armenian codices and published it in Venice in 1876.[2] European scholars did not, as we have seen, at once awake to the importance of the discovery. A passing notice appeared, indeed, in Schürer's *Literary Journal*[3] but does not seem to have attracted attention; and by a strange fate it remained for Dr. Ezra Abbot, in a paper to which I have more than once referred, read before a Ministers' Institute in America, to invite the attention of scholars in Europe to this treasure from the East, which had long been hidden, and now had been made known in their midst. The important contributions of Drs. Zahn, Harnack, Wace, and others, soon followed; and there is now a general agreement among the scholars who have devoted special attention to this subject, that we have in our hands a commentary which is written in Armenian of the

Dr. Mösinger.

Ezra Abbot.

---

[2] Aucher and Mösinger, *Evangelii concordantis Expositio facta a Sancto Ephræmo*, Venice, 1876.

[3] *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1878, No. 25, p. 607.

fifth century, which Armenian is an extremely literal translation from the Syriac, which Syriac is a writing of Ephrem, which writing of Ephrem is his Commentary on the *Diatessaron* of Tatian.

Dr. Wace.

The special contribution which Dr. Wace made to the subject was the investigation of the relation between the *Diatessaron* of Tatian and the *Harmony* of Victor of Capua, to which reference has already been made; and the result of an elaborate analysis is to establish their substantial identity, with the natural difference that in Victor's *Gospel* the text of Tatian appears in Jerome's Latin, whereas Ephraim's Commentary was upon the Syriac text. Another link, which we must not now be tempted to follow, connects Tatian not only through a Latin translation with Victor, but through an old German translation of Victor's Latin *Codex*, with the Saxon epic the *Heliand*,[4] with the martyr Boniface, and with much of old German literature and Christianity.[5]

Dr. Zahn's restoration of the text.

While these investigations were being published by Dr. Wace in an English periodical, Dr. Zahn was issuing from the press his elaborate monograph on the *Diatessaron*,[6] which not only dealt minutely with all the historical and other side questions, confirming the results which Dr. Wace and others had arrived at independently, but also attempted to reconstruct, on the basis of Mösinger's edition of Ephraim's Commentary, together with the quotations in Aphrahat, the original text of the *Diatessaron*. Whatever opinion may be formed as to some of the results of this bold attempt, which have naturally been challenged, the work remains as a striking example of critical acumen and devoted labour. It may not be proved that the *Diatessaron* was originally written in Syriac, though this, if Dr. Harnack will allow me to say so, is now hardly doubtful, or that the Syriac of Tatian proves the still earlier existence of the Syriac of Cureton. This latter point Zahn has himself abandoned. In a letter which he was kind enough to address to me, dated April 24th, 1888, he says:—

---

[4] *Deutsche Dichtungen des Mittelalters. IV. Heliand*, by Rückert, 1876.

[5] Dr. Wace, *Expositor*, 1881, pp. 1–11; 128–137; 193–205. See *ibid.*, 1882, pp. 161–171; 294–312.

[6] *Forschungen*, 1881, vol. i. *Tatian's Diatessaron.*

Older than the Curetonian Syriac.

> In reality I have not changed my first opinion. Only that I am now agreed with Bäthgen in *Der griechische Text des Cureton'schen Syrers*, 1885, that the Syriac of the *Diatessaron* is *older* than the Curetonian. I had not examined this side of the question with sufficient thoroughness when I first wrote upon it.[7]

Result stated by

But in any case this one great fact remains. Here is in substance Tatian's *Diatessaron*. The fact itself and the consequences which are to be drawn from it will gain in emphasis by being expressed in the words of Dr. Adolf Harnack, who is not too friendly a critic of Zahn :—

---

[7] 'Im Wesentlichen habe ich meine anfängliche Ansicht nicht geändert. Nur darin bin ich jetzt mit Bäthgen *Der griechische Text des Cureton'schen Syrers*, 1885, einverstanden, dass das syrische Diatessaron *älter* ist als der Syrus Cur. Diese Seite der Frage hatte ich nicht gründlich genug erwogen, als ich zuerst darüber schrieb.' Cf. *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons*, 1888, Bd. i. pp. 406 sq.

Dr. Harnack.

> In details much of what Zahn has given as belonging to the text of the *Diatessaron* remains problematical, . . . but in all the main points his restoration has been successful. The rediscovery of such a work is in a variety of ways of the very highest importance for the early history of Christianity. . . . We learn from the *Diatessaron* that about 160 A.D. our four Gospels had already taken a place of prominence in the church and that no others had done so; that in particular the Fourth Gospel had taken a fixed place alongside of the three synoptics.[8]

Nor does the romantic history of the *Diatessaron* end here. The interest which was excited by Dr. Zahn's remarkable investigations led to the publication of fuller information than had been previously available about an Arabic MS. of the *Diatessaron* which was known to exist in the Vatican Library.[9] Zahn himself knew it only from the writings of Assemani, Rosenmüller, and Aberklad ;[1] but in the fourth volume of Cardinal Pitra's *Analecta Sacra*, which was published in 1883, there appeared a full account of this version from the pen of Father Ciasca,[2] with a half promise that he might at some time in the future be able to edit it. Meanwhile his account of

Arabic MS. in Vatican,

---

[8] *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 1888, xxiii. p. 81.

[9] *Cod. Vat. Arab.* xiv.

[1] *Forschungen, ut supra*, pp. 294–298.

[2] Cardinal Pitra, *Analecta Sacra Spicilegio Solesmensi parata*, tom. iv. pp. 465–487 (*De Tatiani Diatessaron Arabica Versione*, P. Augustinus Ciasca, Ordinis S. Augustini, published also separately).

it confirmed Zahn's opinion of its close connexion with the Syriac *Diatessaron*.[3]

Leisure did not come to Father Ciasca more than to others, and the MS. was therefore handed over, in 1885, to Professor de Lagarde,[4] who proposed to edit it, but to him came difficulties of both time and type, and the work was returned to Father Ciasca. Meanwhile the vicar apostolic of the Copts, R̃m̃us Antonius Morcos, when on a visit to Rome, was shown the treasures of the Vatican, and on looking at this Arabic MS. remembered that he had seen one like it in Egypt. He forwarded the Egyptian treasure to Rome, and it proved to be such a beautiful specimen of caligraphy that the scribes of the Vatican selected it to publish as an offering to the pope at his jubilee. This gave Father Ciasca the opportunity of editing,

Arabic MS. in Egypt,

edited by

---

[3] 'Id vero (ut ad rem nostram veniamus) potiori ratione dici debet de Diatessaron in codice arabico Vaticano No. xiv. contento, ut ipse Zahn suspicatus est, qui ejusdem codicis integram editionem perutilem putat. Eadem omnino opinio nobis est, qui, si facultas esset, id libenter præstaremus. Verum cum angustia temporis, saltem hoc anno, id operis perficere minime sinat, contenti erimus talem exhibere codicis descriptionem quæ satis sit ad confirmandum viri eruditi opinionem, intimum nempe dari nexum inter hoc opus ac syriacum Diatessaron. Quinimo cum textus arabici codicis e fonte syriaco directe proveniat, ut inferius fuse probabitur, fit inde, ut ejusdem larga notitia, non modo ad confirmandum textum syriacum quoad Evangeliorum concordantiam, verum etiam ad ipsum textum restituendum, plurimum valeat.' *Analecta, ut supra*, p. 466.

[4] 'Septem tantum pagellas impressit, quas edidit in *Nachricten von der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, 17. März, 1886, No. 4, pagg. 151–158.' *Tatiani Evangeliorum Harmoniæ Arabice nunc primum ex duplici codice edidit et translatione Latina donavit* P. Augustinus Ciasca, Romæ, 1888, note, p. v.

Padre Ciasca.

with an introduction full of interesting information, both the Arabic MSS. of the *Diatessaron* in a work which appeared at Rome in 1888.[5] The *Codex Borgianus*, as Ciasca called the second MS., is professedly an Arabic translation from the Syriac of Tatian's *Diatessaron*, and supplies many of the *lacunæ* which existed in the Vatican MS. The claim to be a translation of the *Diatessaron* is fully borne out by a comparison of Father Ciasca's Latin rendering with Professor Mösinger's rendering of the Armenian version; and both these Arabic versions afford, as their learned editor shows, strong support to the various steps by which, during the last few years, we have been led to the restoration of Tatian's *Diatessaron*.

Importance of this discovery.

As we pass from it, let us remember that if these steps are established, and if we are really in the presence of a Harmony of the Four Gospels which was composed by Tatian the pupil of Justin, and included our present Fourth Gospel, then there follow necessarily not only the deductions which I gave just now in the words of Dr. Harnack, but the more important deduction still that it cannot be reasonably doubted that the Fourth Gospel was received by Justin as by Tatian, and that the *Gospels* of the pupil were identical with the *Memoirs* of the master.[6]

The martyrdom

Another instance in which recent investigations have cast light upon a point which is of considerable of Polycarp.

---

[5] Ciasca, *Tatiani, ut supra.*

[6] Cf. Lecture II. pp. 70 sq.

Older view, A.D. 167.

importance in connexion with our subject, is the date of the martyrdom of Polycarp.[7] Five and twenty years ago the date which was accepted by almost universal consent was the year A.D. 167. This was supposed, but without sufficient reason, to be based upon a passage in the *Chronicon* of Eusebius, which was read as though it placed the martyrdom in the seventh year of Marcus Aurelius, while, as a matter of fact, the martyrdom is not placed opposite the year, but below it, without a date, and grouped with other events.[8] The mistake was one which it was easy to make, and which when made it was natural to follow.

The key.

An independent key to the chronology of Polycarp is furnished by the life of the rhetorician, Ælius Aristides, who refers twice, in certain *Sacred Discourses* which are included in his works, to one Quadratus, a proconsul of Asia, that is, to the proconsul who was in office at the time of Polycarp's martyrdom.

Usher, Pearson, and others.

The keen sight of Archbishop Usher noticed this clue; and it was afterwards investigated by Valesius, Bishop Pearson, and Cardinal Noris, but without very satisfactory results. Masson carried the inquiry further,[9] fixing the date at A.D. 166; but his whole argument is vitiated by the mistaken interpretation of Eusebius.

---

[7] Bishop Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1885, i. pp. 629 sq.; ed. 2, 1889, i. pp. 646 sqq.

[8] Bishop Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, p. 629, ed. 2, vol. i. p. 647. The Armenian version of the *Chronicon* is quoted on pp. 557 sqq. Cf. *Eusebi Chronicorum Canonum*, ed. Schoene, 1866, tom. ii. p. 170.

[9] Aristides, Ἱεροὶ λόγοι, ed. Dindorf, 1829, vol. iii., contains Masson's *Collectanea Historica*; first published with Jebb's *Aristides*, Oxford, 1722.

Letronne and Borghesi.

A hundred years later Letronne[1] showed that the chronology must be pushed back, and Borghesi[2] in the next generation carried his conclusions further by the light of special study of the tenure of Roman offices. He placed the condemnation of Polycarp by Quadratus in A.D. 155.

M. Waddington decides for

In the year 1867 M. Waddington followed[3] with a complete reconstruction of the chronology of Aristides. The key-stone is the proconsulship of Julianus, who is also mentioned by Aristides, and this date is fixed by an apparently unimportant inscription which was discovered in March 1864 by Mr. J. T. Wood in the excavations at the Odeum in Ephesus,[4] together with an Ephesian medal commemorating the marriage of M. Aurelius (Verus Cæsar) and Faustina.[5] After most minute investigation and careful dovetailing of incidents—we cannot here follow the remarkable detailed argument—M. Waddington came to the conclusion that Quadratus was proconsul of Asia in A.D. 155–56, and that the 'great Sabbath' on which Polycarp was martyred was

---

[1] Letronne, *Recherches sur l'Égypte*, 1823, pp. 257 sqq.

[2] Borghesi, *Iscrizioni di Sepino*, 1852.

[3] Waddington, *Vie du Rhéteur Aelius Aristide* in *Mémoires de l'Institut*, etc.; *Inscriptions et Belles Lettres*, 1867, xxvi. pp. 203 sq.; and *Fastes des Provinces Asiatiques* in Le Bas and Waddington's *Asie Mineure, Inscriptions Grecques et Latines*, 1870, tom. iii. pt. i. pp. 655–744; No. 138, pp. 726 sq.; Wood, *Discoveries at Ephesus*, 1877; *Studia Biblica*, Oxford, 1885, No. ix., Randell.

[4] Waddington, *op. cit. Inscr.* v. iii. p. 6.

[5] Waddington, *op. cit.*, *Mémoires*, p. 211.

Feb. 23, A.D. 155.

the twenty-third day of February A.D. 155. This is the year, you will remember, which had been fixed by the earlier inquiries of Letronne and Borghesi.

General acceptance of this result.

A result which shifted one of the chronological pivots of the second century backwards by eleven years was not likely to escape the crucible of the critics, and every known test was speedily applied to it. By the consent of almost all competent judges it has in every respect stood these tests. It is not only Letronne, Borghesi, and Waddington who now place the martyrdom of Polycarp in A.D. 155, but also Renan,[6] Aubé,[7] Volkmar,[8] Funk,[9] Zahn,[1] Egli,[2] Friedländer,[3] Marquardt,[4] Schiller,[5] Harnack;[6] Lipsius,[7] Hilgenfeld,[8] and Von Gebhardt,[9] prefer A.D. 156; Keim[1] and Bishop Wordsworth[2] were not convinced; Wieseler[3] and Uhlhorn[4] adhered to the older date.[5]

---

[6] *L'Antéchrist,* p. 566; and *L'Église chrétienne*, pp. 452 sq.

[7] *Histoire des Persécutions*, pp. 319 sq.; *La Polémique païenne*, 1878, pp. 184 sq.

[8] *Jenaer Literaturzeitung*, 1874, No. 274, p. 291.

[9] *Patr. Apost. Opp.*, 1878, i. pp. lxxxiii, xciv sq.

[1] *Ibid.*, 1876, ii. p. 165.

[2] *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1882, 1884, 1888.

[3] *Sittengeschichte Roms*, iii. pp. 440, 442, 654.

[4] *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, 1873, i. p. 375.

[5] *Geschichte der Römischen Kaiserzeit*, 1883, i. ii. p. 684.

[6] *Encyclopædia Britannica*, ed. 9, vol. xix. art. *Polycarp*, p. 415.

[7] *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1874, pp. 188 sq.

[8] *Ibid.* pp. 325 sq.

[9] *Zeitschrift für historische Theologie*, 1875, pp. 377 sq.

[1] *Aus dem Urchristenthum*, Bd. i. 1878, pp. 90 sqq.

[2] *Church History*, i. pp. 161 sq.

[3] *Die Christenverfolgungen der Cäsaren bis zum 3ten Jahrhundert*, 1878, pp. 75 sqq.; *Theol. Studien u. Kritiken*, 1880, pp. 141 sqq.

[4] Art. *Polykarp* in Herzog-Plitt, *Real-Encyklopädie*, ed. 2, vol. xii. pp. 103 sqq.

[5] Cf. for these references:

Bishop Lightfoot's investigations confirm it.

Bishop Lightfoot signified his acceptance of M. Waddington's results as early as 1875,[6] and afterwards in his editions of the *Apostolic Fathers*[7] subjected the whole question, including M. Waddington's essays, to a minute re-investigation, which, while it confirms that learned author's results, does so with the addition of matter which is not less important than that of M. Waddington himself. The correction of the error of centuries in the interpretation of the *Chronicon* of Eusebius, of which I have already spoken, has in effect removed the only serious difficulty in the way of accepting the year A.D. 155 as the date of the martyrdom.

Importance of this date.

The importance of this rectification of date to the present question will be seen when it is remembered that Polycarp was eighty-six years old at the time of his death,[8] and that Irenæus speaks of him as a disciple of John, and as appointed bishop of Smyrna by Apostles; and again speaks of 'the successors of Polycarp to the present time,'[9] that is, from A.D. 177 to A.D. 190. If he lived from A.D. 70 to A.D. 155, both statements are natural; if from A.D. 81 to A.D. 167, neither is free from difficulty. Living

---

Richardson, *Bibliographical Synopsis*, 1887, p. 10; and Bp. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1889, pt. ii. vol. i. pp. 667 sqq. The simplest statement of the question in English will be found in Harnack's art. *Polycarp, ut supra.*

[6] *Contemporary Review*, May 1875, pp. 827 sq.

[7] Ed. 1, 1885; ed. 2, 1889.

[8] *Martyrdom of Polycarp*, cap. ix. Cf. Bishop Lightfoot's note, *Apost. Fathers*, 1889, pt. ii. vol. ii. p. 379.

[9] *Adv. Hær.* iii. 3, 4; ed. Harvey, ii. pp. 12.

from A.D. 70 to 155, his life and work link together S. John, Ignatius, Florinus, Justin, Tatian, Irenæus; and they become an argument for the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel, the force of which it is impossible to deny.

The *Hermathena.*

In the fourteenth number of the Dublin *Hermathena*, a collection of papers published from time to time by the members of Trinity College, and looked for by scholars with an interest which is seldom disappointed—this number was published in 1888, and the paper to which I am about to refer is dated July in that year—appeared an article by Dr. Gwynn, the successor to Dr. Salmon in the chair of divinity, which is entitled *Hippolytus and his 'Heads against Caius.'* It gave us for the first time five passages from an inedited MS. of a Syriac *Commentary on the Apocalypse, Acts, and Epistles*, of Dionysius Bar-Salîbî, to whose *Commentary on the Gospels* I have but just now referred. The MS. is part of the *Rich* Collection acquired by the British Museum in 1830. The *Heads against Caius* are replies made by Hippolytus to some objections which Caius made to the Apocalypse, on the ground that it was opposed to the teaching of the Gospels and S. Paul. In the first of these replies—I pass over the objection of Caius which is not material to our inquiry—Hippolytus explains the passage 'the day of the Lord cometh as a thief,' by a reference to the *children of light* who *walk not in the night*,

Dr. Gwynn on Hippolytus and Caius.

which is certainly Ephesian and probably Johannine.[1] In the fifth 'Head' Hippolytus uses the words 'the Prince cometh and findeth no sin in me,' which are a definite quotation from the Fourth Gospel.[2]

Both accepted the Fourth Gospel.

Caius is spoken of in these replies as 'the Heretic,' and it is clear that he did not, and that Hippolytus did, accept the Johannine authorship of the Apocalypse. It seems to be equally certain that Caius as well as Hippolytus accepted without any question the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel.

No discoveries oppose Johannine authorship.

When I turn to the other side of this part of our evidence, and ask what fresh facts have been discovered which tend to cast doubt upon the Johannine authorship of the Gospel, I find no answer to the question. I cannot assert that no such fact is producible, but I must confess that if it is I have spent a good deal of time in a fruitless search, and that I shall be much surprised if it has been made accessible in the ordinary channels by which such facts are made known.

---

[1] John xi. 10; xii. 35, 36; Eph. v. 8.

[2] John xiv. 30. 'Observe that the quotation from St. John xiv. 30, follows the reading εὑρίσκει, or εὑρήσει, for ἔχει. This reading is found in some copies, and in early patristic citations, and is given in the margin of the Harkleian version. It is noteworthy, that it is adopted into the text of the New College MS. of that version, supposed to be the result of a recension made by Barsalîbi, and known as the Codex *Barsalibæus*. I supply the diacritic point under ܐܠܦ from Bodl.'—*Hermathena*, No. xiv. *Hippolytus and his 'Heads against Caius,'* 1888. Dr. Gwynn's note, p. 417.

Fragments of Papias do not oppose,

but support.

Some stress was laid last year,[3] indeed, on the discovery of fresh fragments of Papias which are probably from the Ecclesiastical History of Philip of Side, who wrote in the early part of the fifth century.[4] The fragment which affects the Johannine question and makes Papias say that John the theologian and James his brother were put to death by Jews,[5] had been met by anticipation by Bishop Lightfoot, who, as long ago as 1875, explained quite satisfactorily[6] the similar blunder of Georgius Hamartolos, which is also given on the authority of Papias.[7] It is, moreover, more than counterbalanced by a fragment of Hegesippus in the same collection, which states that Domitian confined the *Apostle and Evangelist* John in Patmos.[8]

Weight of this negative proof.

And this negative proof which is furnished by recent additions to our knowledge is not less significant than that which is positive. In the very nature of things the positive evidence must be fragmentary.

---

[3] See Jülicher, *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1889, No. 13, pp. 331 sqq.; and cf. Hilgenfeld, *Einleitung* 1875, p. 63, and *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1875, p. 269.

[4] *Neue Fragmente des Papias, Hegesippus und Pierius in bisher unbekannten Excerpten aus der Kirchengeschichte des Philippus Sidetes* von Dr. C. de Boor—Von Gebhardt und Harnack, *Texte und Untersuchungen*, Bd. v. Heft 2, pp. 165–184.

[5] Παπίας ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ λόγῳ λέγει, ὅτι Ἰωάννης ὁ Θεολόγος καὶ Ἰάκωβος ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων ἀνῃρέθησαν, *Ibid.* No. 6, p. 170.

[6] But cf. on the other side Schürer in *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1890. No. 6, p. 142.

[7] Bishop Lightfoot, *Contemporary Review*, October 1875; *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, 1889, pp. 211 sq.

[8] καὶ τὸν ἀπόστολον καὶ εὐαγγελιστὴν Ἰωάννην ἐν Πάτμῳ περιώρισεν· De Boor, *ut supra*, No. 3, p. 169.

Its value lies in the fact that it is fragmentary. A coin in Ephesus, an inscription in Phrygia, a burial chamber in Rome, a MS. in a monastery, a site in Samaria or Galilee—these are, if you will, not more than fossils of a past life, but, differing each wholly from the other, they tell of that life with unquestionable certainty, and they speak in voices of perfect harmony. Is further evidence asked for? It exists in the fact that the whole field of our recent discoveries has disclosed not a single instance of coin, or inscription, or MS., or evidence of any kind whatever, which is, I will not say inconsistent with the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel, but which even suggests that any other person had ever been named or thought of as the author.

Re-investigation of materials.

I pass now to another branch of recently acquired evidence, which is not indeed independent of the discovery of new materials, but depends mainly upon the re-investigation of materials which were already known; and my choice of instances is guided by their importance, by their general acceptance, and by the fact that it will be possible to state them briefly and refer to a full discussion which lies immediately to hand.

The Ignatian Epistles.

First among these instances will come naturally the Ignatian Epistles. The storehouse of materials relating to this subject which has been gathered during nearly thirty years by Bishop Lightfoot[9] contains much that has been made accessible in our own age: as the Syriac Recension, edited by Cureton in 1845 and 1849; the Armenian, edited by Petermann, also in 1849; the Coptic Additions, published by Father Ciasca in 1883, and by Bishop Lightfoot himself in 1885; and all has been subjected to microscopic re-examination. The result is a decisive judgment for 'the priority and genuineness of the seven Vossian Letters.'[1]

---

[9] *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii., 1885, ed. 2, 1889. Cf. Von Gebhardt, Harnack and Zahn, *Patrum Apost. Opp.*, fasc. ii. 1876; Zahn,

Bishop Lightfoot convinced on investigation.

It is the more striking because it is not the opinion with which the investigation was commenced. In the dissertation on 'The Christian Ministry,' attached to the *Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians*, the author writes:—

> Throughout this dissertation it is assumed that the Syriac version represents the epistles of St. Ignatius in their original form. . . . At the same time, I agree with Lipsius that the epistles of the short Greek recension cannot date later than the middle of the second century; and if so, they will still hold their place among the most important of early Christian documents.[2]

Dr. Zahn's statement of the change.

The change of opinion is indicated in 1875, and is complacently described by Zahn in these words:—

> But there are at present in England—where excellent service was of old rendered on the Ignatian question—those who value truth more than the opinions of their countrymen, though these opinions have been received with the greatest

---

Ignatius von Antiochien, 1873; Funk, *Die Echtheit der Ignatianischen Briefe*, 1883.

[1] *Apostolic Fathers*, Ignatius, Polycarp, 1885, vol. i. Preface, p. vii.

[2] *Epistles of S. Paul*, Philippians, eds. 1-3, 1868-73, p. 232.

applause in other countries; and it is to me a special satisfaction to observe that J. B. Lightfoot, a man of sober judgment, and having great weight through his exquisite learning, who formerly took Cureton's side, has gradually come over to my opinion.[3] . . . In a paper published in the *Contemporary Review*, February 1875, he said with great modesty that he could not decide between the three epistles of Cureton and the seven of Eusebius, but he wrote to me on the sixteenth of December in the same year in the following terms: *I ought to explain that, since I wrote the article on Ignatius, I have been more and more strongly impressed with the unity and priority of the seven Epistles as representing the genuine Ignatius.*[4]

In 1879, in the new edition of the *Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians*, the bishop gives the following note on his change of view :—

> In the earlier editions of this work I assumed that the Syriac Version published by Cureton represented the Epistles of Ignatius in their original form. I am now convinced that this is only an abridgment and that the shorter Greek form is genuine; but for the sake of argument I have kept the two apart in the text. I hope before long to give reasons for this change of opinion in my edition of this father.[5]

---

[3] *Patrum Apost. Opp.*, *ut supra*, p. vi.

[4] 'At sunt etiam hodie in Britannia, optime quondam de Ignatio merita, quibus magis amica veritas, quam opiniones e Britannia ortæ, quamvis magno exterorum applausu exceptæ; ac magno me affecit gaudio, quod I. B. Lightfootium, sobrii judicii virum ac doctrina exquisita pollentem, qui e Curetonii parte quondam steterat, paullatim in eandem mecum convenire sententiam cognovi. . . . cum in tractatu edito in *Contemporary Review* 1875 (Febr.) p. 358 modestissime dixisset hæsitare se utrum tres epistulæ Curetonii ac septem Eusebii genuinæ habendæ essent, litteris die 16 Dec. 1875, ad me datis hæc mecum communicavit. . . .' *Patrum Apost. Opp.*, *ut supra*, p. vi, foot-note.

[5] *Philippians*, *ut supra*, ed. 1879, p. 234, note.

In 1885 Bishop Lightfoot writes :—

> Indeed Zahn's book, though it has been before the world some twelve years, has never been answered; for I cannot regard the brief and cursory criticisms of Renan, Hilgenfeld, and others, as any answer.

And then adds, as always, *modestissime*—

> Moreover there is much besides to be said which Zahn has not said.[6]

Result.

Another's estimate of what the bishop has himself said will help us to see the importance of the judgment which he has given :—

> It has been our wish to exhibit in all its bearings the main questions which Dr. Lightfoot has sought to answer; and we have no hesitation in saying that he has answered these questions with triumphant success. The genuineness of the Vossian letters has been finally established; the wisdom of Ussher has been fully vindicated; and the Ignatian controversy has been set at rest, with little chance or none of being again reopened. Dr. Lightfoot's mode of dealing with the evidence which his unwearied toil has brought together, will commend itself even to those who may take up the book with prepossessions in favour of the Tübingen school of critics; and his main conclusions will, beyond doubt, be accepted by all impartial and independent students and thinkers. Those who can appreciate, further, the critical skill, the vast labour, the wide range and variety of learning, and the conscientious care needed for the achievement of this great task, will feel grateful for efforts which, in spite of all hindrances and distractions, have been crowned with decisive success.[7]

Still fresh materials

Nor has even the short period since Bishop Lightfoot's work was published been without its additional evidence. A second edition appeared just before his death. He was able to announce fresh converts, including M. de Pressensé, who had previously expressed a strong view against the Vossian recension, and is able to refer to additional materials, in versions, manuscripts and inscriptions, all of which support the view which he had adopted.[8]

---

[6] *Apostolic Fathers, ut supra,* Pref. p. vii.

[7] *Edinburgh Review,* No. 335, July 1886, pp. 136-7.

confirm the view.

Dr. Harnack's judgment.

Dr. Harnack is well known to hold views differing widely from those of Bishop Lightfoot on important questions connected with the Ignatian Epistles, and he expresses these with his usual candid friendliness in his review of the bishop's work. But he has no doubt about the genuineness :—

> Whether these Epistles are genuine or not, is one of the main problems of early Church history. Upon the decision of this question depends more than can be indicated in a short sketch. After repeated investigations, the genuineness of the Epistles seems to me certain, and I hold the hypothesis of their spuriousness to be untenable. In this conclusion I agree with Lightfoot, and I also thank him for having removed many difficulties in detail which I had previously felt.[9]

Date of the Epistles.

Dr. Harnack has held in connexion with his general view of the chronology of the bishops of Antioch, an opinion which is probably peculiar to himself as to the possible date of the Ignatian Letters, and his latest expression of it is :—

---

[8] Cf. *Apostolic Fathers*, 1889, pt. ii. vol. i. Preface, pp. vii, viii.

[9] *Expositor*, Jan. 1886, p. 10. Cf. *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1886, No. 14, pp. 316–319, where Harnack speaks of this work—and Schürer has just endorsed the opinion (*Ibid.* 1890, No. 6, p. 142)—as 'wohl die gelehrteste und sorgfältigste patristische Monographie, welche im 19. Jahrhundert erschienen ist.'

The Epistles of Ignatius and Polycarp were probably written after the year A.D. 130.[1]

But a consensus of the judgments of scholars has practically determined that the death of Ignatius cannot be placed later than A.D. 117.[2]

Johannine quotations about A.D. 110.

One of the results of modern investigation then is that we possess seven Letters written by Ignatius, and addressed severally to the Ephesians, the Magnesians, the Trallians, the Romans, the Philadelphians, the Smyrnæans, and Polycarp. Nor is there further place for intelligent doubt that these Epistles contain quotations of the Fourth Gospel;[3]

---

[1] *Expositor,* March 1886, p. 192. Cf. Harnack, *Die Zeit des Ignatius, u.s.w.*, 1878.

[2] 'His martyrdom may with a high degree of probability be placed within a few years of A.D. 110, before or after.' Bishop Lightfoot, *Apost. Fathers*, ed. 1889, pt. ii. vol. i. p. 30.

'. . . we shall be doing no injustice to the evidence by setting the probable limits between A.D. 100–118, without attempting to fix the year more precisely.' *Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 472.

The following is a summary of the opinions of the chief authorities:—

A.D. 105–117. Zahn, R. T. Smith.

A.D. 107. Usher, Ruinart, Tillemont, Ceillier, Gallandi, Busse, Wieseler, Möhler, Funk, Roberts, and D. Schmid.

A.D. 114. Borghesi.

A.D. 115. Chronicon Paschale, Volkmar, Ueberweg, Kurtz.

A.D. 115–6. Lloyd, Pagi, Grabe, Smith, Routh, Gieseler.

A.D. 116. Pearson.

A.D. 138?. Harnack.

See Richardson: *Bibliographical Synopsis*, 1887, p. 15.

[3] It is not within the compass of a note to examine these quotations fully, but the following references will justify the statement in the text. The numbers refer to the pages of the edition of Ignatius in Bishop Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, pt. ii. vol. ii. 1889.

Ephes. v.: *ἐὰν μή τις ᾖ ἐντὸς τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου, ὑστερεῖται τοῦ ἄρτου* [*τοῦ Θεοῦ*], pp. 43, 44.

Rom. vii.: *ἄρτον Θεοῦ θέλω, ὅ ἐστιν σὰρξ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, κ. τ. λ.*

These passages are best taken together, as both are clearly suggested by the Gospel (cf. John vi. 27, 31, 33, 48; and for the context the whole passage, vi. 27–59). The that is, the result of our present most learned and widely accepted criticism on the Ignatian question,

θυσιαστήριον is here the court of the congregation, and seems to be suggested by the Manna of S. John, pp. 225, 226.

Two lines before the passage just quoted, the letter to the Romans contains the expression *ὕδωρ δὲ ζῶν† καὶ λαλοῦν†*—'Doubtless a reference to John iv. 10, 11, as indeed the whole passage is inspired by the Fourth Gospel,' p. 224. If we adopt the reading *ζῶν ἁλλόμενον* from the Interpolator's text, we have a further striking parallel with John iv. 14.

Ephes. vi.: *οὕτως δεῖ ἡμᾶς αὐτὸν δέχεσθαι, ὡς αὐτὸν τὸν πέμψαντα.* p. 46. John xiii. 20.

Ephes. xvii.: *Διὰ τοῦτο μύρον ἔλαβεν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς [αὐτοῦ] ὁ Κύριος, ἵνα πνέῃ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀφθαρσίαν.* Cf. John xii. 3. 'Joannes vero exhibet quod prætermiserunt Matthæus et Marcus, *ἡ δὲ οἰκία ἐπληρώθη ἐκ τῆς ὀσμῆς τοῦ μύρου.*' Zahn, *Patr. Apost. Opp. ut supra*, p. 22. 'Zahn truly remarks that the allusion here implies a knowledge of S. John's Gospel.' Pp. 72, 73.

Ibid.: *τοῦ ἄρχοντος τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦτου*,. Again, cap. xix. *Magn.* i., *Trall.* iv., *Rom.* vii., *Philad.* 6. Cf. John xii. 31; xiv. 30; xvi. 11, p. 73.

Magn. vii.: *Ὥσπερ οὖν ὁ Κύριος ἄνευ τοῦ πατρὸς οὐδὲν ἐποίησεν, κ.τ.λ.*, p. 121. 'Respicere Ignatium ad Joann. v. 19, 30; x. 30; xv. 4; xvi. 15, tantum non affirmo,' Zahn, *ut supra*, p. 35; cf. *Const. Apost.* p. 54, 23, ed. Lagarde; cf. also John viii. 28.

Ibid. ad fin.: *εἰς ἕνα ὄντα*, p. 123. 'Quoniam autem redux e mundo apud patrem versatur, apte dictum est: *εἰς τὸν ἕνα* . . . non *ἐν τῷ ἑνί.* Cf. Joann. i. 18,' Zahn, *ut supra*, p. 35. Cf. also John i. 1; xiii. 3; xiv. 12, 28; xvi. 10, 16, 17, 28.

The chapter of the Epistle to the Magnesians to which these references are made, occupies ten lines in the large print of Bishop Lightfoot's edition.

Magn. viii. *ad fin.*: *ὃς κατὰ πάντα εὐηρέστησεν τῷ πέμψαντι αὐτόν.* p. 126. Cf. John viii. 29.

Rom. iii. *ad fin.*: *ὅταν μισῆται ὑπὸ κόσμου.* Cf. John vii. 7; xv. 18, 19; xvii. 14; 1 John iii. 13, p. 205.

Philad. vii.: *οἶδεν γὰρ πόθεν ἔρχεται καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγει*, a definite quotation from John iii. 8. 'The coincidence is quite too strong to be accidental. Nor can there be any reasonable doubt that the passage in the Gospel is prior to the passage in Ignatius. The application in the Gospel is natural. The application in Ignatius is strained and secondary; nor is his language at all explicable, is to assert that the Fourth Gospel was received by Ignatius and by the churches of Asia Minor, including the church of Ephesus, at a date which is earlier—it may be several years earlier—than the year A.D. 117.

Other contemporary writings.

The dates of the *Epistle of Barnabas* and of the *Didache* are too uncertain for us to lay much stress upon them here as witnesses—both may be earlier than the death of the Apostle John; but they, as well as the *Epistles* of the Roman Clement and the *Shepherd* of Hermas, at least support the Johannine authorship of the Gospel by a stream of Johannine doctrine and phraseology which is too strong to have been accidental.[4]

Epistle of Polycarp.

Closely bound up with the question of the Ignatia Letters, and standing or falling with them, is the genuineness of the Epistle of Polycarp.[5] This is a Letter of the martyr to the church at Philippi, existing in a Latin translation which was first published in 1498. Of the Greek, only part has been preserved, and this was first edited in 1633. The external

---

except as an adaptation of a familiar passage,' p. 266.

Philad. ix.: *αὐτὸς ὢν θύρα τοῦ πατρός*, Cf. John x. 9 and Rev. iii. 8. Bishop Lightfoot notes that this latter image is also in a letter to the Philadelphians, pp. 274, 275.

[4] Cf. *Patr. Ap. Opp.*, *ut supra*, esp. the *Indices*: and Charteris, *Canonicity*, 1880, pp. i–xxxiii and 167–176. Reference may also perhaps be permitted to the article 'John, Gospel of,' in the forthcoming edition of Dr. Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*. For the *Didache*, cf. Von Gebhardt u. Harnack, *Texte u. Untersuchungen*, Bd. ii. Heft 2; Schaff, *The Oldest Church Manual*, ed. 3, 1889; and Plummer, article in the *Churchman*, July 1884.

[5] Cf. Bishop Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, i. pp. 562 sq.

evidence of its genuineness includes Irenæus, who speaks of 'a very powerful Epistle of Polycarp, written to the Philippians'; Eusebius,[6] who quotes the testimony which the Epistle bears to the Ignatian Letters;[7] and Jerome, who tells us[8] that it was publicly read in the churches of Asia. Everything in the Letter itself supports the statements which are thus made about it, and Dr. Harnack is justified in saying :—

Dr. Harnack's view.

> It would certainly never have occurred to any one to doubt the genuineness of the epistle, or to suppose that it had been interpolated, but for the fact that in several passages reference is made to Ignatius and his epistles.[9]

But, if the Ignatian Letters are independently proved to be genuine, this argument against the Letter of Polycarp is not only cancelled, but it gives a considerable positive quantity on the other side. The Ignatian Letters are genuine: then the only argument against the Polycarp Letter disappears. The Polycarp Letter is genuine: then it strongly confirms the genuineness of the Ignatian Letters, which has been independently established.

Importance of the Letter.

The importance of the genuineness of the Letter of Polycarp in the present question is indirect but therefore of the greater value. Beyond question it bears witness to the First Epistle of S. John, and equally beyond question is this Epistle a witness to the Gospel.[1] The Letter dates from the martyrdom of Ignatius,—after the journey of Ignatius to Rome, and before Polycarp had heard of the martyrdom; that is to say, not later than A.D. 118, perhaps as early as A.D. 112, there is a Letter of Polycarp which quotes as authentic the First Epistle of S. John, which itself is subsequent to the Fourth Gospel and was written by the same hand.

---

[6] *Adv. Hær.* iii. 3, 4; ed. Harvey, ii. pp. 14 sq.

[7] *Hist. Eccles.* iii. 36.

[8] *De Vir. illust.* cap. xvii.; ed. Benedict., Verona, 1735, tom. ii. p. 843.

[9] *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 1885, xix. p. 414.

Silence of Eusebius.

The name of Bishop Lightfoot will be remembered also in connexion with an induction which is, I venture to think, second in far-reaching importance to nothing which he has left to us on the early history of the Church. I refer to the essay on the *Silence of Eusebius*, which was first published in the *Contemporary Review* in January 1875, and again in the collected essays on the work entitled *Supernatural Religion* last year.[2] This is not an example of new material, but a generalization from already existing materials. Eusebius is the chief source of information about the ecclesiastical literature of the second century; and this induction, which is based upon a minute examination of particulars, and was placed before the world as a distinct challenge now fifteen years ago, has acquired the position of a law of interpretation, the value of which cannot be too highly estimated. Let me read it to you in the author's own words:—

---

[1] Cf. Lecture VI. pp. 346 sq.

[2] *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, pp. 32-58.

'*Hypotheses non fingimus.* We have built no airy castles of criticism on arbitrary *a priori* assumptions as to what the silence of Eusebius must mean. We have put the man himself in the witness-box; we have confronted him with facts, and cross-examined him; thus we have elicited from him his principles and mode of action. I may perhaps have fallen into some errors of detail, though I have endeavoured to avoid them, but the main conclusions are, I believe, irrefragable. If they are not, I shall be obliged to anyone who will point out the fallacy in my reasoning; and I pledge myself to make open retractation. . . .

'I now venture on a statement which might have seemed a paradox if it had preceded this investigation, but which, coming at its close, will, if I mistake not, commend itself as a sober deduction from facts. *The silence of Eusebius respecting early witnesses to the Fourth Gospel is an evidence in its favour.* Its Apostolic authorship had never been questioned by any church writer from the beginning, so far as Eusebius was aware, and therefore it was superfluous to call witnesses. It was not excused, because it had not been accused. . . .

'If any one demurs to this inference, let him try, on any other hypothesis, to answer the following questions:—

'(1) How is it that, while Eusebius alleges repeated testimonies to the Epistle to the Hebrews, he is silent from first to last about the universally acknowledged Epistles of St. Paul, such as Romans, 1, 2 Corinthians, and Galatians?

'(2) How is it that he does not mention the precise and direct testimony in Theophilus to the Gospel of St. John, while he does mention a reference in this same author to the Apocalypse?

'And this explanation of the silence of Eusebius, while it is demanded by his own language and practice, alone accords with the known facts relating to the reception of the Fourth Gospel in the second century.'[3]

---

[3] *Essays, ut supra*, pp. 51–2.

Syriac version of Eusebius.

Nor is it by silence only that Eusebius is speaking, and about to speak, afresh to this generation. Up to the year 1855 the great work of the Father of Church History was known to us from Greek sources only, and of the available Greek MSS. none are earlier than the tenth century.

Cureton.

But Canon Cureton published in that year a selection of Syriac documents, and gave an extract with a translation of a Syriac version of the *Ecclesiastical History* by Eusebius.[4] In 1871 Dr. Dindorf published in his own edition of Eusebius the following note from Canon Cureton :—

> I am occupied in preparing an edition of the ancient Syriac version of the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius. I have two manuscripts of it at my disposal. One, most kindly lent to me by His Majesty the Tzar, from the Imperial public library at S. Petersburg, dated A.D. 462. This volume contains, with certain lacunæ, books i.–iv. and viii.–x. Of books v. and vii. only small portions remain, and book vi. is wholly wanting. The Nitrian manuscript, preserved in the British Museum, which I am now collating with my copy of the Petersburg manuscript, is of somewhat later date (the date has been erased and is no longer legible), but very carefully written. It contains books i.–v. almost complete.[5]

Dindorf.

Professor Dindorf gives a specimen of the version from a comparison of the texts of the British Museum and the Imperial Library at S. Petersburg. This he was enabled to do through the kindness of Professor William Wright and Professor Ludolph Krehl.

---

[4] *Spicilegium Syriacum*, 1855, pp. 56–60.

[5] Eusebius, ed. Dindorf, tom. iv. Pref. pp. vi sq.

In 1880, Professor Adalbert Merx announced, at the meeting of the Oriental Congress at Florence, that Professor Wright had prepared an edition of this version, which he hoped to publish together with an English translation and notes by Dr. Field, who is known to us all as the learned editor of the *Hexapla* of Origen.[6]

Armenian version. Merx.

But Dr. Merx heard the first news of this Syriac MS. when he was at Venice, learning Armenian; and his friend and tutor, P. Arsenius Sukrean, informed him that an Armenian version of Eusebius had been printed the year before. He was convinced, and gives reasons which are, I think, fully convincing, that the Armenian is not made from the original in Greek but from the Syriac, and that it contains the sections which are wanting in the Syriac. The Armenian has also independent notes of time which confirm the early date assigned to the Syriac version. This throws us back then far into the fourth century, and makes it probable that not long after the work of Eusebius became known in Greek, it was known also in Syriac, and thus made accessible to both Eastern and Western Christendom. This view is confirmed by the practice of Cyril of Alexandria, who at the beginning of the fifth century published his work *On the Faith* in both Greek and Syriac.[7]

You will see of what immeasurable importance this discovery may prove to be. It may reveal to us, with a certainty which has not been attainable in modern times, the history of the Church during the first three centuries; and it is already known that it fully confirms the history on which we have been hitherto dependent. Cureton and Wright and Field and Bishop Lightfoot are no longer with us in bodily presence; but it is to be hoped that the work prepared, now some years ago, may be forthcoming without much delay. Professor Merx writes to me on the last day of last year with reference to the Armenian version:—

---

[6] *Atti del* iv. *Congresso internazionale degli Orientalisti.* Firenze, 1880, vol. i. pp. 199–214.

[7] Wright, *Catalogue of Syriac MSS. in the British Museum*, pt. ii. p. 719.

> I hope I will get assistance to complete the whole, which is difficult for me as it is to be printed in English, so that without the correcting eye of an Englishman it cannot be accomplished.

Syriac Apology.

I have referred in an earlier lecture[8] to an Apology addressed to the Emperor Antoninus, which was also given to us from the same Collection of Nitrian MSS. by Canon Cureton in 1855.[9] Many critics of weight regard this Apology as really the work of Melito, and some would identify it with the Apology of which we have fragments in Eusebius.[1] The matter is not one of sufficient importance to justify our further discussion of it. There seems to me good ground for not ascribing it to Melito himself, and equally good ground for believing that it dates from his period. It is interesting as showing the kind of evidence which has been lying all around us though we knew it not, and the wide field which is open for the investigation of scholars.

---

[8] Lecture I. p. 35.

[9] *Spicilegium*, *ut supra*, pp. 41–56.

[1] *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 26.

Conclusion.

But the time has now arrived when this division of our subject must be brought to a conclusion. I have endeavoured in the three lectures of the Lent term to set before you 'the judgment of centuries' upon the Fourth Gospel, and have in the four lectures of this term tried to examine the criticism of 'our age.' I am well aware how fragmentary the treatment of so wide a subject has necessarily been, but I have desired to give every important witness some hearing, and especially every witness who has anything to adduce against the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel. Your patient endurance will confirm my conviction that while some names have been passed over, others might have been omitted without serious loss.

No body of negative criticism which is not self-destructive.

And, now, what does it all prove? Where is this destructive criticism, which is, by a definite and compact body of measured proof, to establish the fact that the convictions of all previous ages are a series of mistakes, and that 'our age has cancelled the judgment of centuries'? Evanson, Bretschneider, Strauss, Baur, Hilgenfeld, Volkmar, Renan, Scholten, Keim, Davidson, and the rest—where is their collective wisdom, where the fixed results of their investigations? By what laws of evidence is a case to be supported in which almost every witness contradicts the witness on his own side who has gone before, and then contradicts himself? What is the value of that man's evidence who tells us plainly, first, that he is certain, then that he is doubtful, then that he is doubtful about his doubts, then that he is certain as to his doubts about his doubts—but thinks his opinion may yet change? What verification is possible for theories which assure us now that the Gospel is the growth of unconscious myth, now the result of deliberate design; now that its roots are metaphysical, now that they are mystical; now that the work is clearly composite, now that it is absolutely one; now that the discourses are trustworthy, but not the history; now that the history is trustworthy, but not the discourses; now that the author is clearly a Jew, now that he is certainly a Greek; now that he is a Syrian, now that he is an Alexandrian; now that the whole teaching bears the impress of Philo, now that it is permeated by the Gnosticism of Basilides? What dependence can be placed upon investigations which assure us with equal confidence that the gospel was written in A.D. 180, 170, 160, 150, 140, 120, 110, or even far back into the first century?

The positive is to the negative criticism as $\frac{1}{0} = \infty$.

If all these clashing, contradicting, self-destroying, each-other-cancelling theories of 'our age' are now placed beside the calm and deliberate judgment of the second and all succeeding centuries, and with the positive judgment and knowledge of our own day, what is the effect? Is it less than to divide positive unity by a positive zero, and is not the result a positive infinity? As I am speaking these words, a sentence from Strauss comes back to my thoughts, and I know not how better to express my meaning—it will not be thought that Strauss applied his words in quite the same sense:—

> The subjective criticism of the individual is like a water-pipe which any urchin can stop up for a time. Criticism, when in the course of centuries it accumulates objectively, rushes along like a roaring river, against which dams and dykes are powerless.[2]

Sugges-tions of author other than S. John valueless.

I will not detain you by asking what answer the negative criticism of this century would give to the legitimate demand that it should find an author who would meet the complex conditions of the Johannine problem;[3] though, as we have seen,[4] the 'judgment of centuries' could not be cancelled by any body of destructive criticism even if it existed. The answers are valueless, as the guesses about Nathaniel or Apollos, or they are worse than valueless. Is it not almost incredible that a man, knowing anything of the Origins of Christianity, should have thought of Cerinthus as the author of the Fourth Gospel? But this suggestion comes from M. Renan.[5] Is it not more than incredible that any one who had ever read a chapter of this Gospel should have suggested that the disciple whom Jesus loved, the original author of the Gospel, was Judas Iscariot? But this is the distinction of Herr Ludwig Noack, who published four erudite but most repulsive volumes on the Life of Jesus, in 1870–71.[6] These are not dams or dykes—they are mere drains, which the roaring river carries away without leaving a mark behind.

---

[2] 'Die subjective Kritik des Einzelnen ist ein Brunnenrohr, das jeder Knabe eine Weile zuhalten kann: die Kritik, wie sie im Laufe der Jahrhunderte sich objectiv vollzieht, stürzt als ein brausender Strom heraus, gegen den alle Schleussen und Dämme nichts vermögen.' *Die christliche Glaubenslehre*, 1840, i. Preface, p. x.

[3] Cf. the opinion of Dr. Martineau, quoted in Lecture V. p. 287.

[4] Cf. Lecture IV. p. 173.

[5] 'Tout est possible à ces

The river of the past strengthened in

Meanwhile, the nineteenth century has been like those which have preceded it. On every hand fresh fountains of deeper knowledge, fresh streams of positive criticism, have contributed to the volume of the

---

époques ténébreuses ; et, si l'Église, en vénérant le quatrième Évangile comme l'œuvre de Jean, est dupe de celui qu'elle regarde comme un de ses plus dangereux ennemis, cela n'est pas en somme plus étrange que tant d'autres malentendus qui composent la trame de l'histoire religieuse de l'humanité.' *L'Église Chrétienne*, 1879, p. 54. Cf. 'Jean, à ce qu'il paraît, repoussait les doctrines de Cérinthe avec colère.' *Les Évangiles*, 1877, p. 420.

[6] *Aus der Jordanwiege nach Golgatha. Darstellung der Geschichte Jesu auf Grund freier geschichtlicher Untersuchungen über das Evangelium und die Evangelien.* Mannheim, 1870–71. I cannot advise anyone to experience the pain of referring to a work which reaches a deeper depth than any which I have elsewhere known with any pretension to scholarship or thought. The Fourth Gospel is treated in vol. iii. pp. 37–236. The following passage will sufficiently show the writer's view of the authorship : 'Wir erkennen also im BUSENJÜNGER des vierten Evangeliums den JUDAS THADDÄUS oder LEBBÄUS der synoptischen Ueberlieferung und finden diesen nicht verschieden von dem andern Judas, der in letzterer als Verräther bezeichnet' . . . *Ibid.* p. 190. After this, nothing will cause surprise, or it would seem startling to learn that Golgotha is not in Jerusalem but in Samaria at *Kefer Lud*, and that Gabbatha = *Gennatha*, with much more of the same nature and the same value. *Ibid.* iv. pp. 78 and 141–143.

flood; and the river of the past rolls on in the present fuller, stronger, more irresistible than it has ever been before. the present.

And now I trust that the technicalities which have wearied us too long are ended. In the next and concluding lecture, I hope to deal for the most part with the influence which modern thought should have on our conceptions of the spiritual realities of the Fourth Gospel.

LECTURE VIII

INTERPRETATION OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL

THE PROBLEM OF TRANSLATION

ΑΛΛΑ ΚΑΙ ΕΑΝ ΦΗΣ ΔΕΙΞΟΝ ΜΟΙ ΤΟΝ ΘΕΟΝ ΣΟΥ, ΚΑΓΩ ΣΟΙ ΕΙΠΟΙΜΙ ΑΝ ΔΕΙΞΟΝ ΜΟΙ ΤΟΝ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΝ ΣΟΥ ΚΑΓΩ ΣΟΙ ΔΕΙΞΩ ΤΟΝ ΘΕΟΝ ΜΟΥ. . . . . . .

. . . .

ΠΑΝΤΕΣ ΜΕΝ ΓΑΡ ΕΧΟΥΣΙ ΤΟΥΣ ΟΦΘΑΛΜΟΥΣ, ΑΛΛΑ ΕΝΙΟΙ ΥΠΟΚΕΧΥΜΕΝΟΥΣ ΚΑΙ ΜΗ ΒΛΕΠΟΝΤΑΣ ΤΟ ΦΩΣ ΤΟΥ ΗΛΙΟΥ. ΚΑΙ ΟΥ ΠΑΡΑ ΤΟ ΜΗ ΒΛΕΠΕΙΝ ΤΟΥΣ ΤΥΦΛΟΥΣ ΗΔΗ ΚΑΙ ΟΥΚ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΟ ΦΩΣ ΤΟΥ ΗΛΙΟΥ ΦΑΙΝΟΝ, ΑΛΛΑ ΕΑΥΤΟΥΣ ΑΙΤΙΑΣΘΩΣΑΝ ΟΙ ΤΥΦΛΟΙ ΚΑΙ ΤΟΥΣ ΕΑΥΤΩΝ ΟΦΘΑΛΜΟΥΣ.

Theophilus.

LECTURE VIII.

Many other signs therefore did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book:
but these are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in his name.—John xx. 30, 31.

Results from earlier lectures.

If you have been good enough to follow the arguments which I have endeavoured to place before you in the earlier lectures of this course, you will, I believe, admit that sufficient reason has been shown for accepting the judgment of ages expressed now by tradition, now by the religious consciousness of the community or of the individual; here by decree of council, or statement of a Father of the Church, there by the inner light, or the canons of historical and literary criticism. You will, I believe, also admit that sufficient reason has been shown for refusing to accept the statement that any consistent body of negative criticism has arisen in our own age which can cancel that judgment; and for believing that in this century, as in the Christian centuries which have preceded it, there has been an accumulating mass of evidence in favour of the genuineness of the writing which we are justified in calling, without trace of uncertainty in our voice, 'The Gospel according to S. John.' I shall also venture to hope,

The Fourth Gospel is 'according to S. John.'

though I confess my confidence is here less sure, that no one will be unprepared to admit that, when the writer of this Gospel claims that his Master promised His abiding spiritual presence to the Church and promised the inspiration of the Comforter in these words,—

> But the Comforter, even the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you,[1]

Inspiration is of the essence, not of the form.

the promise was made and fulfilled for 'all things,' for the substance, that is, and not for the mere form of the revelation of Christ Himself. In other words, it will, I trust, be admitted that even in this most spiritual Gospel, it is the matter, that is to say the eternal reality, and not the form, that is to say the temporal expression of the reality; the essence of the truth and not the accident of language, construction, word; the spirit which quickeneth, and not the letter which killeth;—that it is the matter, essence, spirit, not the form, accident, letter, which is inspired. It is the Gospel of Jesus Christ; it is the Gospel according to S. John. The treasure is divine; the vessel is earthen. I am making no claim on behalf of this writing, or any other writing of the New Testament, that it is more than the earthen vessel in which the treasure of inspired truth is contained. The 'Word of God' is contained in, but is not identical with, the written or spoken word of even inspired men. The necessity of human thought which seeks some visible form of the Divine, and is rightly satisfied in the Incarnation and spiritualized in the Ascension, has expressed itself when these doctrines have not been known or have not been fully grasped, as in idolatry, in human infallibility, in Mariolatry, in sensuous modes of worship, so also in a bibliolatry which claims for the material form the divinity which belongs only to the spiritual essence. But the treasure would not be affected, even if the vessel which contains it were cracked or marred. It should not therefore seriously disturb our faith in the divine Gospel, if the immediate connexion of this one outward form of it with the Apostle John were much less certain than it is; nor should it greatly concern us if some or all of the many flaws which microscopic critics think that they have found in this earthen vessel were really to be seen there, though the more they are examined by men of sober vision, the more they are found to be in the critic or in the instrument of his criticism, in the eye or in the microscope, and not in the object upon which they are directed. If, then, I make no claim for even this Gospel according to S. John that it is in the external form which is human, absolutely free from every possibility of error, I do claim none the less that the Gospel of Jesus Christ which it contains, is divine, and that to the divine there can be no ascription of error.

---

[1] John xiv. 26.

The vessel is not, the contents are, divine.

But this discussion of modern criticism and the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel has not been to

This discussion

not an *apologia.*

me simply an academical exercise. I may be mistaken, but in my own view, it is not an *apologia* for a creed. Had it been that, there could have been no justification either for my presence in this place, or for my absence from the practical work of 'that state of life unto which it hath pleased God to call me.' The justification to myself at least, for venturing to address you, is the conviction that this writing is the most sacred in our worlds of time and space, that it contains the fullest revelation of God to man, that in the depth of this divine treasure there is the truest satisfaction of human needs, and the truest solution of human problems for the nineteenth century as for the first, for the present as for the past, for the future as for the present: and in the conviction that some men are in danger of missing the treasure, because they claim for the outward form of it a perfection which it has not, and in the very nature of things cannot have; that other men are in danger of missing the treasure, because they cannot help seeing and attacking the weakness of this claim to outward perfection; and that other men are in danger of missing the treasure, because amidst these loud and conflicting words of man they cannot hear the still small voice of God.

This Gospel the treasure of humanity.

Danger of missing it.

Differences necessary in revelation;

The purpose of the present lecture, then, is to show that while those who accept the results of the previous lectures, and believe that the Fourth Gospel is 'the Gospel according to S. John,' have still to πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως.

meet the problem of the marked differences between this Gospel and the Synoptics, such differences find their explanation in the circumstances under which the Gospel was written, and, so far from causing any difficulty, are even necessary to the fulness of the revelation of God in the varying conditions of man.

Different forms of the one Gospel.

Now the fourfold frame in which God has willed that the Church should receive the one Gospel of Jesus Christ ought to have made it impossible to confound form and substance; and though this has not always been the case, any serious attempt to understand the Gospel according to S. John must, in the present state of knowledge, start from the conviction that it is in form widely different from that according to S. Matthew, or S. Mark, or S. Luke.

This expressed by Bretschneider,

When Bretschneider supposes, for example, that if the Gospel of John had remained unknown through the eighteen earlier centuries, and at length had been discovered in the East, and had been published in our own day, we should all have admitted with one voice that the Jesus described by John is very different from the Jesus of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and that both representations could not be at the same time true, and that there would be good reason for our doing so;[2] when M. Renan asserts that if Jesus and Renan.

---

[2] 'Si forte accidisset, ut Joannis evangelium per octodecim secula priora prorsus ignotum jacuisset, et nostris demum temporibus in Oriente repertum et in medium productum esset, omnes haud dubie uno ore confiterentur, Jesum a Joanne descriptum longe alium esse ac illum Matthæi, Marci et Lucæ, nec utramque descriptionem simul veram esse posse. Nec ita sine gravi judicaretur ratione.' *Probabilia*, 1820, p. 1. Cf. Lecture IV. pp. 181 sq.

spake as Matthew makes him speak, he could not have spoken as John makes him speak,[3] and sends us to our New Testaments, and we read the Sermon on the Mount side by side with the Capernaum discourse of the sixth chapter or the farewell of the sixteenth and seventeenth chapters of S. John, or compare the parables of the one writing with the allegories of the other, we feel that though all this may be explained, too much explanation is not quite satisfactory, and that Dr. Bretschneider and M. Renan have some reason for their opinion.

Baur's view of a tendency-writing,

And when Dr. Baur and those who think with him assert that the Gospel is not history but theology, that from beginning to end it is marked by unity of purpose, that it is a *Tendenz-Schrift*,[4] and send us to the Gospel itself, and we analyze it, and see how light and darkness, love and hatred, truth and error, life and death, are made the sustaining ideas running through the whole warp and woof of the material; how just those signs are chosen—they are signs, there is no miracle, but all becomes natural in his intense realization of the Divine presence—which illustrate these thoughts; and how every sign is the text of a sermon, just as if it were chosen out of the book of nature, answering to the touch of nature's God, in order that this very sermon should be preached from it; we feel that in this respect Dr. Baur and the tendency school are as wholly right, as Dr. Strauss and his theory of myth are wholly wrong. The Fourth Gospel is a theological unity; it is marked all through by distinct design; events are so narrated and discourses are so connected with them, as to carry out this design from beginning to end. But it did not need Dr. Baur to tell us this, though at the moment he did great good by telling it. The Gospel itself, in the words which formed its original ending and which supply the text of our present thoughts, tells us clearly—and the statement is repeated in hyperbolic form in the present ending—that it is a selection of signs, that the selection was made with a definite threefold purpose, and declares what this purpose was:—

---

[3] 'Si Jésus parlait comme le veut Matthieu, il n'a pu parler comme le veut Jean.' *Vie de Jésus*, ed. 1, 1863, Introduction, p. xxix.

[4] Cf. Lecture V. p. 234.

and the Gospel claims to be so.

> Many other signs therefore did Jesus in the presence of the disciples, which are not written in this book:
>
> [And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself would not contain the books that should be written.]
>
> but these are written, (1) that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, (2) the Son of God; and that (3) believing ye may have life in his name.

And when Bretschneider and Strauss and Baur and M. Renan and others agree in the opinion that the whole Gospel is in form different from the Synoptics, and belongs to an altogether different point of view, they agree in stating what no intelligent and well-instructed reader denies. The details of supposed or real differences may be here passed over, because they

Difference in form admitted.

take their place in a class of minor questions which belong to the form and not to the essence of the Gospel, and they have been more than sufficiently discussed in recent essays and commentaries. The chief of them may serve as an example in passing: The supposed discrepancies as to the Paschal Feast which have such a prominent place in the arguments of Baur, have been made the subject of minute investigations by Dr. Schürer,[5] who in this particular line of Judaistic lore is an acknowledged authority; and he seems to establish the fact that, whatever the solution of the problem may be, the authorship of the Fourth Gospel—you will remember that he does not himself accept the Johannine authorship[6]—is in no way affected by it.

Details may be here passed over.

The difference as a whole,

But the feeling about the discourses and the general tone upon which Dr. Baur and M. Renan have from different points of view laid so much stress, is one which every student of the Gospel must more or less fully share, though he would in reverence shrink from their particular forms, or perhaps from any forms of expressing it; and this is of the essence of the matter and touches the Gospel itself, and therefore lies immediately in the path of our inquiry.

the subject of inquiry.

---

[5] *De Controversiis paschalibus, secundo p. Chr. nat. sæculo exortis*, 1869; *Die Passastreitigkeiten des 2. Jahrhunderts* in *Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie*, 1870, pp. 182–284. A good *résumé* of Dr. Schürer's arguments is given in English in Luthardt's *St. John the Author of the Fourth Gospel*, ed. Gregory, 1875, pp. 154–165.

[6] Cf Lecture V. p. 283.

I have stated but just now, and have elsewhere tried to show[7] that this difference in the discourses admits to some extent of explanation, and is to some extent exaggerated.[8] Still, the more the Gospel is read and studied, the more the feeling asserts itself that we are touching an altogether different circle of expressions, constructions, and even modes of thought, from that with which we are familiar in the Synoptic Gospels; and that while the discourses differ from those of the Synoptics, they agree with the style of the author of the Gospel, as we find it in the narrative portions and in the First Johannine Epistle, and even with that of John Baptist and other persons who are introduced as speakers.

---

[7] Cf. Bishop Ellicott's *New Testament Commentary for English Readers*, vol. i. p. 557; *Excursus D, The Discourses in St. John's Gospel.*

[8] Dr. Plummer gives the following interesting extract from a letter written by Cardinal Newman on July 15, 1878:—

'Every one writes in his own style. S. John gives our Lord's meaning in his own way. At that time the third person was not so commonly used in history as now. When a reporter gives one of Gladstone's speeches in the newspaper, if he uses the first person, I understand not only the matter, but the style, the words, to be Gladstone's: when the third, I consider the style, etc. to be the reporter's own. But in ancient times this distinction was not made. Thucydides uses the dramatic method, yet Spartan and Athenian speak in Thucydidean Greek. And so every clause of our Lord's speeches in S. John may be in S. John's Greek, yet every clause may contain the matter which our Lord spoke in Aramaic. Again, S. John might and did select or condense (as being inspired for that purpose) the matter of our Lord's discourses, as that with Nicodemus, and thereby the wording might be S. John's, though the matter might still be our Lord's.' *Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools, S. John*, 1882, p. 100.

The following words of Dr. Mommsen will be seen to have also a very important bearing upon the subject:—

'The position of Asia Minor as occupying the first rank in the literary world of the imperial period was based on the system of the rhetors, or, according to the expression later in use, the sophists of this epoch—a system which we moderns cannot easily realise. The place of authorship, which pretty nearly ceased to have any significance, was taken by the public discourse, somewhat of the nature of our modern university and academic addresses, eternally producing itself anew and preserved only by way of exception, once heard and talked of, and then for ever forgotten.' Theodor Mommsen, *History of Rome: The Provinces from Cæsar to Diocletian.* Eng. Trans. 1886, vol. i. p. 363.

This difference where we might have expected agreement, and agreement where we might have expected difference, cannot be denied; and its significance cannot be too strongly asserted. But it would seem to be in entire harmony with the origin and purpose of the Gospel, and in the statement of these I shall seek to find the lessons with which to conclude this course of lectures.

The key lies in *translation.*

The key to the Fourth Gospel lies in *translation*, or, if this term has acquired too narrow a meaning, transmutation, re-formation, growth; nor need we shrink from the true sense of the terms, development and evolution. I mean translation in language from Aramaic into Greek; translation in time extending over more than half a century, the writer passing from young manhood to mature old-age; translation in place from Palestine to Ephesus; translation in outward moulds of thought from the simplicity of Jewish fishermen and peasants, or the ritual of Pharisees and priests, to the technicalities of a people who had formed for a century the meeting-ground, and in part the union, of the philosophies of East and West.

Realization of the Apostle's position.

If we earnestly attempt to realize the life of the Apostle and the circumstances under which the Gospel was composed, it will lead us to understand how this process of development must have taken place in the inspired writer, and how absolutely essential it was to the purpose of his writing.

Life in Ephesus.

S. John must upon any plan of his life which can be set forth with fair show of probability, have spent thirty years or more at Ephesus.[9] Bilingual[1] from boyhood, as Galilæans of his time and his position usually were, in the earlier part of life perhaps predominantly Hebrew, he would by necessity of circumstance become in the latter part predominantly Greek. His special work is to be Apostle and overseer of a church which S. Paul had planted, which from its very seedtime had grown up in the midst of such discussions as we know to have taken place, for instance, in the school of Tyrannus.[2] Apollos, the eloquent Alexandrian, is an example at once of the links which bound Ephesus to surrounding cities and influences, and of the kind of teacher who was welcomed by the growing Church. The Pauline Letters to the Ephesians, the Colossians, Timothy, are evidence in thought and word of the deeper philosophical form in which the knowledge of the Gospel of Jesus Christ had been imparted to them; and of the dangers which had already arisen, and threatened to arise in more abundant measure, from the subtlety of thought, the tendency to uncontrolled speculation, the claim to Gnosis falsely so called, which characterized alike the later Greek and the Oriental culture, and sprung into vigorous life nowhere so fully as in Asia Minor and Alexandria, where these cultures were united.

---

[9] ‘ Le nom moderne d’Éphèse, *Aïa-Solouk*, paraît venir de Ἁγία θεολόγου ou Ἅγιος θεόλογος.’ [Cf. Reference to coins, in Wood's *Ephesus*, 1877, pp. 182–3, which were struck at Ayasalouk, and bear the name ‘Theologos,’ and go ‘far to prove that St. John's church was erected at that place.’] ‘Il est vrai qu’on prononce et qu’on écrit souvent *Aïaslyk* (Arundell, ii. 252), où l’on est tenté de voir la terminaison turque *lyk*. Mais l’orthographe correcte est *Soloûk* (voir Ibn-Batoutah, ii. p. 308). Comparez *Dara-Soluk*, près de Sardes. La porte qui donne entrée à la citadelle peut dater de l’époque chrétienne. On y employa des sculptures païennes, qu’on interpréta dans un sens chrétien.’ Renan, *Saint Paul*, 1869, p. 342, note 2.

[1] Those who do not agree in his conclusions will nevertheless thank Dr. Alexander Roberts for his valuable contributions to the discussion of this subject. They are given, with a fair statement of the objections, in the author's *Greek the Language of Christ and his Apostles*, 1888. But cf. Dr. Neubauer's learned essay *On the Dialects spoken in Palestine in the time of Christ: Studia Biblica*, 1885, pp. 39–74.

The Church.

The concourse of peoples.

And outside the fold of the Church, what a seething mass was there of contending systems, all claiming a hearing; many claiming, each for itself, that it was the one solution of the mystery of Being, of all things in heaven and earth and sea! What a Babel of confused tongues, while the speakers thought to raise their towers to the very heaven of heavens!

The sects of philosophy.

Chrysostom tells us that 'All the sects of Grecian philosophy cultivated their science in Ephesus,'[3] and we know from the story of Justin Martyr's conversion,[4] the kind of inquiries which men made there in the generation after John, and which men doubtless made in the second half of the first, as they certainly did in the first half of the second century.[5] Jews were there in large numbers from the first planting of the Church, and the numbers multiplied after the destruction of Jerusalem.[6] Judæo-Christians, Ebionites, Essenes left their traceable marks upon the currents of the great stream of Asiatic thought. Syrians and other Easterns were there, and the special forms of Oriental Gnosticism, the Naasenes and the Ophites, which appear at the opening of the second century, must have had their roots deep in the first.[7] Men were there from the further East, and voices might have been heard telling how the mystery of Being had found its solution in the life and doctrine of Gautama whom they called the Buddha, and that in Nirvāna was the highest good of perfect life, a half-true and therefore all-false pantheism which told men then, as it tells some men now, that the highest

---

[2] Acts xix. 9.

[3] *Homil. I. in Joannem.* Cf. Lampe, *Commentarius*, 1724, vol. i. p. 51.

The East,

---

[4] Cf. Lecture II. pp. 58 sq.

[5] 'Éphèse devenait pour un temps le centre de la chrétienté, Rome et Jérusalem étant, par suite de la violence des temps, des séjours presque interdits au culte nouveau.' Renan, *L'Antéchrist*, 1873, p. 209.

[6] 'Le point du monde romain où la vie était alors le plus supportable pour les juifs était la province d'Asie. Il y avait entre la juiverie de Rome et celle d'Éphèse des communications perpétuelles. Ce fut de ce côté que se dirigèrent les fugitifs.' . . . *Ibid.* p. 206.

[7] 'L'Asie Mineure était alors le théâtre d'un étrange mouvement de philosophie syncrétique; tous les germes du gnosticisme y existaient déjà.' Renan, *Vie de Jésus*, 1879, p. lxxi. Cf. Lecture VII. pp. 372 sq.

being is the ceasing to be, and that the first philosophy of human life is to deny the first postulates of individual existence, which Intellect, and Will, and Conscience, and Feeling, with distinct but united voice demand. And there from time to time were men who told of emanations and incarnations of the Divine, of which they had learned by tradition and from sacred books that had come down to them hoary with antiquity; for to those acutest thinkers of Aryan stock, incarnation seemed to be an actual necessity, though to some among ourselves it has seemed an impossibility, of thought. And there were many from the West, from Egypt and Rome and Greece. Some of them might have been heard to speak of strange religious mysteries; of animals sacred in their nation from the earliest records, because to them they represented God; of colossal forms transcending all experience and suggesting the Infinite; of apotheosis, that antithesis to incarnation, the attempt to bridge from the human side the gulf between man and God; of idolatry, which is at once the caricature of and the witness to incarnation; of personification, by which every power of nature and thought of man might become a god; of temples for the body, dead yet not dead; of transmigrations of the spirit, the same and not the same. And more frequently and consistently than any of these strange voices, might have been heard the teaching of the eclectic philosopher, Philo. Somewhat older than the Apostle, but for many

and West.

Philo.

years a contemporary, an Alexandrian Jew of high position and exceptional culture, steeped in Rabbinic lore, and yet so permeated by Plato, that men often said 'Philo is platonising, or Plato is philonising;' dissatisfied with the literal explanation of the origin of Being which he learnt in the synagogue, and seeking in the mysticisms of the far East what he could not find in the West, at once an effect and a cause of the philosophy of Alexandria and Ephesus, placing in the forefront of his teaching the method of allegory which has ever characterized the Alexandrian schools, using every possible term to express the union of matter and spirit, grasping alike from Rabbis and from Stoics the doctrine of the Logos as the link between God and man, and yet holding it as it were in solution, uncertain whether there is one Logos or many, almost saying, and yet never fully saying, that the Logos is a person.[8]

The cult of Diana.

And all this was beneath the shadow of the great temple of Diana of the Ephesians, with its hierarchy and courses of trained *theologi*[9] and *exegetes*—of Diana who had come down from heaven and was worshipped as the source of life on earth ; for this temple was to last for yet two centuries, and images of the goddess and her shrine represented the highest truth to men, women, children, not alone in the great city of Ephesus, but in all the region round about.

---

[8] The literature of *Philo* and the *Logos* is almost inexhaustible. It is a satisfaction to be able to refer to two quite recent English treatises which from different points of view are equally thoughtful and learned:—the late Dr. Edersheim's article *Philo* in Smith and Wace's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, vol. iv. pp. 357 sqq.; and the invaluable induction of Dr. Drummond in his *Philo Judæus*, 2 vols., 1888. In immediate relation to our present inquiry reference may be made, in addition to the better known treatises, to Soulier, *La Doctrine du Logos chez Philon d'Alexandrie*, Turin, 1876; Klassen, *Die alttestamentl. Weisheit u. der Logos, u. s. w.* 1879; and Jean Réville, *La Doctrine du Logos dans le quatrième Évangile et dans les œuvres de Philon*, 1881.

[9] The *theologi* are named in an inscription from the Great Theatre

The city. The outline of daily life at Ephesus which is thus suggested may be easily expanded and coloured, for the literature[1] of the subject is no longer scanty. It will of course be remembered that Ephesus was on the one hand a great commercial centre and port, and on the other a luxurious Eastern city, the *de facto* capital of the province of five hundred towns.[2]

---

of Ephesus. Cf. Wood, *Discoveries at Ephesus*, 1877, p. 22 (θεολόγοις).

[1] Cf. Guhl, *Ephesiaca*, 1843, esp. cap. iii. pp. 78–140 ; Falkener, *Ephesus and the Temple of Diana*, 1862 ; Wood, *Discoveries in Ephesus*, 1877 ; Renan, *S. Paul*, 1869, pp. 329–349 ; Lewin, *Life and Epistles of S. Paul*, ed. 3, 1875, vol. i. pp. 313–414 ; Farrar, *Life and Work of S. Paul*, vol. ii. pp. 1–44 ; De Pressensé, *L'Ancien Monde et le Christianisme*, ed. 4, 1889 ; Mommsen, *History of Rome*, *ut supra*, pp. 320–367 ; Plumptre, *S. Paul in Asia Minor*, pp. 89–138.

[2] 'The proper metropolis of the province was Pergamus, the residence of the Attalids and the seat of the diet. But Ephesus, the *de facto* capital of the province, where the governor was obliged to enter on his office, and which boasts of this 'right of reception at landing' on its coins ; Smyrna, in constant rivalship with its Ephesian neighbour, and, in defiance of the legitimate right of the Ephesians to primacy, naming itself on coins 'the first in greatness and beauty ;' the very ancient Sardis, Cyzicus, and several others strove after the same honorary right.' Mommsen, *History of Rome*, *ut supra*, vol. i. pp. 329 sq.

'But, if the Roman merchants were to be found here apparently in every large and small town, even at places like Ilium and Assus in Mysia, Prymnessus and Traianopolis in Phrygia, in such numbers that their associations were in the habit of taking part along with the town's burgesses in public acts ; if in Hierapolis, in

Business and pleasure,[3] not philosophy or religion, brought most who came there from afar; but the time and the people were marked by a great upheaving of the spirit of religious inquiry, and there

---

the interior of Phrygia, a manufacturer (ἐργαστής) caused it to be inscribed on his tomb that he had in his lifetime sailed seventy-two times round Cape Malea to Italy, and a Roman poet describes the merchant of the capital who hastens to the port, in order not to let his business-friend from Cibyra, not far distant from Hierapolis, fall into the hands of rivals, there is thus opened up a glimpse into a stirring manufacturing and mercantile life not merely at the seaports. Language also testifies to the constant intercourse with Italy; among the Latin words which became current in Asia Minor not a few proceed from such intercourse, as indeed in Ephesus even the guild of the wool-weavers gives itself a Latin name. (Συνεργασία τῶν λαναρίων, Wood, *Ephesus*, city, n. 4).' Mommsen, *History of Rome*, *ut supra*, pp. 360 sq.

[3] 'Il y avait des siècles qu'Éphèse n'était plus une ville purement hellénique. Autrefois, Éphèse avait brillé au premier rang, du moins pour les arts, parmi les cités grecques; mais à diverses reprises, elle avait permis aux mœurs de l'Asie de la séduire. Cette ville avait toujours eu chez les Grecs une mauvaise réputation. La corruption, l'introduction du luxe étaient, selon les Grecs, un effet des mœurs efféminées de l'Ionie; or, Éphèse était pour eux le centre et l'abrégé de l'Ionie. La domination des Lydiens et celle des Perses y avaient tiré l'énergie et le patriotisme; avec Sardes, Éphèse était le point le plus avancé de l'influence asiatique vers l'Europe. L'importance excessive qu'y prit le culte d'Artémis éteignit l'esprit scientifique et favorisa le débordement de toutes les superstitions. C'était presque une ville théocratique: les fêtes y étaient nombreuses et splendides; le droit d'asile du temple peuplait la ville de malfaiteurs. De honteuses institutions sacerdotales s'y maintenaient et devaient chaque jour paraître plus dénuées de sens. Cette brillante patrie d'Héraclite, de Parrhasius, peut-être d'Apelle, n'était plus qu'une ville de portiques, de stades, de gymnases, de théâtres, une ville d'une somptuosité banale, malgré les chefs-d'œuvre de peinture et de sculpture qu'elle gardait encore.

'Quoique le port eût été gâté par la maladresse des ingénieurs d'Attale Philadelphe, la ville s'agrandissait rapidement et devenait le principal *emporium* de la région en deçà du Taurus. C'était le point de débarquement de ce qui arrivait d'Italie et de Grèce, une sorte d'hôtellerie ou d'entrepôt au seuil de l'Asie. Des

is little danger of exaggerating the force of the religious movements of which Ephesus was the centre, and of which the history in the nineteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles is an instructive example.

The Apostle's work,

Among the influences of such a daily life as this, John must have lived for more than a quarter of a century. He was a shepherd of the flock of Christ. We know something of the impression which his ministry left from the familiar stories of the bow,[4] of the robber,[5] of the encounter with Cerinthus,[6] of the

---

populations de toute provenance s'y entassaient, et en faisaient une ville commune, où les idées socialistes gagnaient le terrain qu'avaient perdu les idées de patrie. Le pays était d'une richesse extrême ; le commerce, immense ; mais nulle part l'esprit ne se montrait plus abaissé. Les inscriptions respirent la plus honteuse servilité, la soumission la plus empressée aux Romains. On eût dit l'universel rendez-vous des courtisanes et des viveurs. La ville regorgeait de magiciens, de devins, de mimes et de joueurs de flûte, d'eunuques, de bijoutiers, de marchands d'amulettes et de médailles, de romanciers. Le mot de "nouvelles éphésiennes" désignait, comme celui de "fables milésiennes," un genre de littérature, Éphèse étant une des villes où l'on aimait le plus à placer la scène des romans d'amour. La mollesse du climat, en effet, détournait des choses sérieuses ; la danse et la musique restaient l'unique occupation ; la vie publique dégénérait en bacchanale ; les bonnes études étaient délaissées. Les plus extravagants miracles d'Apollonius sont censés se passer à Éphèse. L'Éphésien le plus célèbre du moment où nous sommes était un astrologue nommé Balbillus, qui eut la confiance de Néron et de Vespasien, et qui paraît avoir été un scélérat. Un beau temple corinthien, dont les ruines se voient encore aujourd'hui, s'élevait vers la même époque. C'était peut-être un temple dédié au pauvre Claude, que Néron et Agrippine venaient de "tirer au ciel avec un croc," selon le joli mot de Gallion.' Renan, *ut supra*, pp. 335–9.

[4] Cassian, *Collationes*, xxiv. c. 21, ed. Hurter, 1887, pp. 781 sq.

[5] Clem. Alex., *Quis dives salvetur?* § 42, ed. Klotz, tom. iii. pp. 353 sqq.

[6] Iren. *Adv. Hær.* iii. 4, ed. Harvey, tom. ii. pp. 12 sqq. Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* iii. 28; iv. 14.

message of love.[7] How often must this disciple whom Jesus loved have told them about His life, His deeds, His words! How often must he have realized the promise that the Comforter would bring all things to remembrance whatsoever the Master had said to him! What a number of things must have been related in all those years, by the disciple who had heard most from Jesus, and from personal endowment and imparted grace had been most receptive of what he had heard! How almost natural becomes the exaggeration of some Ephesian churchmen, who had listened to all this:—

> And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself would not contain the books that should be written.

How often must Holy Baptism which lies at the root of one discourse in the Gospel,[8] and Holy Eucharist which lies at the root of another[9]—though the institution of neither sacrament is mentioned, since both were of old-established usage long before the Gospel was written—have revealed the power of sacramental grace and the very presence of Christ in their midst! How often must the chief pastor of the Church have come into personal contact with the doubts and difficulties of inquirers and catechumens, just as an English bishop in Calcutta or Ceylon would talk out the difficulties of some Brahman or Buddhist, in his own and teaching.

---

[7] Jerome, in *Epist. ad Galatas*, vi. 10, ed. Bened. Veronæ, 1737, pp. 528 sq. Cf. Mrs. Jameson, *Sacred and Legendary Art*, ed. 3, vol. i. pp. 166 sqq.

[8] John iii. 1–22.

[9] John vi. 43–59.

technical language, and from his own point of view! How often must he have given addresses which no Luke lived long enough to record, based it may be upon the Pauline model, for the Acts of the Apostles was probably in his hands; and have shown that He whom they also ignorantly groped after, was declared to them in the person of Jesus Christ; that all this seeking after God in human form that mind of man may grasp Him, this Messianic hope, this apotheosis, this theory of incarnations, this personification, even this idolatry, this doctrine of Logos, this system of Gnosis, all this every day talk of *Arche*, and *Propator*, and *Zoe*, and *Monogenes*, and *Anthropos*, of *Grace* and *Glory* and *Truth*, and the rest, by which men made successive links to reach from earth to heaven, that it all meant the yearning of the soul after God, yes, the yearning of humanity for a visible conception of God, and that all this was fulfilled in the Gospel which he declared unto them! How often must he have told some student of Philo, or some Gnostic disciple of Cerinthus in the course of those years:—

> In *Arche* was the *Logos*, and the *Logos* was face to face with God, yea the *Logos* was God. The same was in *Arche* face to face with God. All things were made by him, and apart from him was not anything made. That which hath been made was *Zoë*, in him; and the *Zoë* was the *Phōs* of the *Anthrōpoi*; and the *Phōs* is ever shining in the darkness, and the darkness overcame it not.[1]

---

[1] ΕΝ ΑΡΧΗ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος. Οὗτος ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν θεόν. πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς

Or again :—

> And the *Logos* became flesh and tabernacled among us, and we looked upon his *Doxa*, the *Doxa* of the *Monogenēs* from with a Father, full of *Charis* and *Alētheia*.[2]

Or again :—

> Because of his *Plerōma* we all received, and *Charis* growing out of *Charis*. For the Law was given through Moses, *Charis* and *Alētheia* came to be through Jesus Christ. No man hath ever yet seen the nature of God. *Monogenēs* who is God, and who is ever in the bosom of the Father, he hath been the *Exegete*.[3]

They were living in a world of shadows ; he had the reality of realities to declare to them. They said that the Word was now a creature, now an ideal abstraction, now a mere appearance, now limited by another principle in creation, now the creative idea of God. He said that the Word was 'in the beginning,' 'was God,' 'became flesh,' that 'all things were made by him,' and 'without him was not anything made that was made.' They spoke of philosophies of the origin of being, and of the knowledge and glory of God. He spoke of one who had taber-

---

αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν. ὃ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων· καὶ τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φαίνει, καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ οὐ κατέλαβεν. . . .

[2] *Καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός, πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας· . . .*

[3] *Ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ πληρώματος αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς πάντες ἐλάβομεν, καὶ χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος· ὅτι ὁ νόμος διὰ Μωυσέως ἐδόθη, ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐγένετο. θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώποτε· μονογενὴς θεὸς ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο.* John i. 1-6, and 14, 16–18.

nacled among men, upon whose glory he had gazed, who was the Only-begotten of the Father, of whose fulness of grace and truth he had received. They spake of visions of God. He declared that no man had seen God at any time; that the Only-begotten, who was in the bosom of the Father, He had been the Exegete, the Interpreter who had declared Him to man.

The close of life

And now the years of his life, already lengthened beyond the natural span, were drawing to a close. He had written nothing of all that he had taught of the wondrous words and deeds of Christ. He had perhaps expected that the end of the dispensation would come before the end of life. The Gospel he had so often declared was well known in the Church; but his spiritual children could see that the time was at hand when his voice would be heard no more, and they therefore entreat him to give them the blessing of a record which should remain with them, and tell them in his own words something of all that Jesus had done, and of all that Jesus had said.

Natural desire for a record.

The traditional account of the origin of the Gospel.

The very early tradition of the Muratorian Fragment,[4] which there is no sufficient reason to question and which is confirmed by the Alexandrian Clement, relates how his fellow disciples and bishops exhorted him; how he bade them fast with him for three days, and tell each to other what revelation he might receive about writing the book; how in the same night it was revealed to Andrew, that John should describe all the events in his own name, but they should all assist him in revising his work.[5] It is natural to imagine that more than one of his fellow disciples had made notes of what he had often told them; it is natural to imagine that some younger hand[6] actually held the pen with which the Gospel was written; it is not impossible that the style of a born Ephesian scribe through whose mind and hand the words passed, as the divine Paraclete brought all things to the Apostle's remembrance, and the old man spake the words which were re-kindled in his thoughts, may have left its mark, on here and there a word, on here and there a form of expression that was thus fashioned after the exact idiom of the Ephesian speech. This is possible, perhaps probable; but it seems to be beyond question that the Ephesian life of the Apostle had been so interpenetrated by the atmosphere in which he lived, that he could not have spoken the Fourth Gospel in the last decennium of the first century and in Ephesus, in any other language than that in which we find it; and further that, if he had done so, he would have spoken in a language which could not be understood by the people, and would have missed the very purpose for which he spoke. It follows that the whole external form in

---

[4] Tregelles, *Canon Muratorianus*, 1867, pp. 32 sqq.; cf. Lecture I. pp. 42 sqq.

The circle of disciples and friends.

The work,

---

[5] Cf. Clem. Alex. apud Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* vi. 14; *ibid.* iii. 24; and Lücke, *Commentar*, ed. 3, 1840, pp. 185 sqq.

[6] Cf. the closing scene of Bede's life, Lecture III. pp. 162 sq.

if Johannine, necessarily Ephesian.

which the Gospel is clothed was Ephesian, and necessarily Ephesian, because it was Johannine, but that the whole inner reality of the truth which was expressed in this form was the Gospel of Jesus Christ, brought home to the Apostle's mind, as he himself claims in his record of the promise, by the special guidance into all truth, and the vivifying of faculty to recall the teaching of Christ Himself, which is the work of the Holy Ghost.[7]

Example: The doctrine of the Logos.

The doctrine of the Logos, the divine Word, for example, does not seem to have been, in the form at least in which it meets us in the Prologue of the Gospel, any part of the direct teaching of Jesus. It seems to have been suggested by the various statements about the Logos which the Platonists, the Philonists, the Ebionites, the Docetists, the Dualists, of Ephesus were constantly making. It meets these half-statements in a series of definite utterances, which take almost the form of a creed, all of which can be gathered from the teaching of Jesus as the Apostle knew and remembered it, and under the inspiring guidance of the Holy Spirit were thus gathered. The very term Logos, which he alone of the New Testament writers uses in this technical sense, was doubtless used by him because it was floating in the stream all around him. He had been familiar with it from the days of Galilee and the synagogue, for every Jewish boy who heard the Targums read, heard of the *Mêmrâ da-Yĕyâ*,[8] the

---

[7] John xiv. 26.

[8] מֵימְרָא דַיְיָ Cf. Levy, *Wörterbuch . . . Targumim*, *s.v.*

Word of Jehovah, and it can perhaps be proved that the distinctive characteristics of the Johannine doctrine of the Logos are to be traced to the Targums rather than to Philo, though, be it remembered, Philo's own conceptions had been moulded by Hebrew rather than by Greek influences.[9] It had been from childhood stored up in his memory, and had grown with his life; and now in old age he heard men constantly speaking, in strangely varying terms, of the *Logos*. Meanwhile he had been a companion of the life of Jesus,[1] had felt His power, had seen the reality of the heavenly glistering through the form of the earthly, had witnessed the risen life, and the fulfilment of the promise of Pentecostal gift, had for more than fifty years known the power of that life in Church and sacrament and individual soul, as he had known it in himself, had seen the *Logos* in Apocalyptic vision;[2] and these men who think themselves wise and claim special *Gnosis*, and wear the garb of philosophers, are for ever talking of the *Logos*, without understanding what they say. What they dimly conceived, that he could plainly declare; what they yearned for, that he had been commissioned to give:—

> That which was from *Arche*, that which we have heard, that which we have seen with our eyes, that which we beheld, and our hands handled, concerning the revelation of life—the *Logos* which is *Zöe*—(and the life was manifested, and we

---

[9] Cf. Westcott, *Gospel according to S. John*, 1882, pp. xv–xviii; and Excursus, *Doctrine of the Word* in Ellicott's *New Testament Commentary*, 1879, vol. i. pp. 552 sqq. (Watkins).

[1] John i. 14.

[2] Rev. xix. 13.

have seen, and bear witness, and declare unto you the life, the eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us); that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you also, that ye also may have fellowship with us. . . . .[3]

The revelation of eternal life in the Incarnation; that is the doctrine of the Logos.

Translation explains the uniform tone of thought and expression,

If, by your kind attention, I have been in any degree able to convey what I mean by saying that the key to the Fourth Gospel is to be found in translation, it will not be necessary to offer any further explanation of the general and uniform tone of thought and language which admittedly permeates the Gospel from end to end; nor will you fail to see what is the truth which underlies the at first sight perplexing phenomena, that men of established critical eminence have arrived at so many, and so apparently diverse conclusions, with regard to its origin and scope:—

and the opposing views of critics.

It is Hebrew in matter and form, more so than any book of the New Testament.

It is distinctly anti-Jewish, and the most widely universal book of the New Testament.

It is obviously influenced by the thought and language of Philo, and is written by a Jew of Alexandrian culture.

It contains Pauline elements, and is manifestly composed, in part at least, of Pauline materials.

It is Gnostic, both in the main ideas and in the expressions.

It is Montanist, and this accounts for the doctrine of the Paraclete.

---

[3] 1 John i. 1–3.

No human view expresses the fulness of the divine.

All these statements are true; and no one of them is true. The Gospel is not Jewish, not Hellenic, not Philonian, not Alexandrian, not Pauline, not Gnostic, not Montanist; but it is all these, and more than these. There is no one of these views which, if properly expressed, is not true of the Gospel, and is not even necessary to the conception of the Johannine authorship which I have sought to present to you. A Hebrew of Hebrews, the fundamental purpose of the writer is that men might believe that 'Jesus is the Messiah'; but he is a Hebrew with whom the forms of Judaism have passed away. The temple has been overthrown; Jerusalem has been destroyed. He gazes not upon the Sea of Galilee, but upon the Mediterranean, which washes the shores of the civilized world, and upon the great avenues to the East. He looks not upon fishermen's boats, but upon the ships of commerce and traffic, which link peoples whom the sea does but seem to divide. The Church has gathered in of all nations, and his Judaism has widened into universalism, because he has seen that it was, in the providence of God, a preparation for a religion of humanity; and the second fundamental purpose of the Gospel is therefore that men might believe that Jesus is 'the Son of God.' It must have had elements of Philo, though they are fewer than men have sometimes thought, for Ephesus was as Philonian as Alexandria was. It must have had elements of Paul, for John is the Apostle of the completion, as Paul was the Apostle of the foundation. It must have had forms parallel to those of Gnostic and Docetic thought, for it was to meet these strivings after truth. Its doctrine of the Paraclete gave rise, it may be, to the later perversions of Montanism, but was of especial necessity for a people who talked of Paracletes[4] without knowing what meaning really underlay the words, and for a church some of whom had not, up to S. Paul's visit, even heard that there was a Holy Ghost.[5] The man who will think out what S. John was, and what Ephesus was, and what the Gospel according to S. John must have been, will find that it must have contained all these and many other elements; and if he will analyze it, he will find that it does contain them. Each critic has been proud of his own prism, and by means of it has seen his own human parti-coloured light; while all taken together prove that the Gospel is more than human, and that in the harmony of all the varied hues of finite knowledge is the clear light of infinite and eternal truth.

Translation a problem for all time.

And this process of translation is necessary not only for the first century and for Ephesus; but for every time and for every place. The problem has presented itself, and has been now more now less fully met—more fully as Theology has exercised, less fully as she has abdicated her sovereignty of the sciences

---

[4] Cf. Excursus on *The meaning of the word Paraclete* in Ellicott's *New Testament Commentary*, 1879, pp. 561 sqq. (Watkins).

[5] Acts xix. 2.

—in the whole history of the Church. Let me ask you to inquire how far it is the problem of the nineteenth century, the problem of the England of to-day, the England which has formed so much of the world in the past, and is making still more in the present; the problem of the Oxford of to-day, the Oxford which has made so much of the England of the past, and is, God blessing her, to make still more of the England of the future.

The problem of to-day.

We look not upon the Lake of Galilee, nor yet upon the land-locked Mediterranean, but upon mighty oceans, whose waters are the highways of continents. Our ports are filled, not with the boats of fishermen, or the small vessels of an inland sea, but with huge and swift merchant ships of peace, and armed ships of war, whose circuit is the known world. Steam and electricity have spanned the oceans, and we speak across the great deeps. The printing-press has made it possible, and education has made it actual, that the progress of knowledge should be no longer the privilege of a caste, but the common heritage of the brotherhood of man. We are members of an empire upon which the sun never sets. Queen Victoria has reigned for more than fifty years over dominions compared with which the empires of the East, of Greece, of Rome, of Alexander, of Augustus, of Charlemagne, of Napoleon, sink into insignificance. The Queen of England and Empress of India reigns to-day over more Mohammedan subjects than the Sultan does. She has probably more Buddhists among her peoples than she has

Christians, though the proportion is quickly changing.[6] The English language has extended its sway more rapidly even than the English rule; it is taught now in every country in the world; and a careful authority has estimated that at its present rate of progress it will within a century become universal. This spread of empire, this binding into one great nationality of so many diverse peoples, with diverse histories, languages, customs, religions, gods; this unity of language, which is fast making it possible for the English press to speak to all humanity;[7] this union for the first time in the history of the world, of the rule of empire, and of the sway of speech, of first-century Rome and first-century Greece, under one sceptre; this new world across the Atlantic, the West which is daughter and friend of the East, happily her rival only in the arts and blessings of peace, in no sphere more happily or more successfully her rival than in those studies which have for their immediate aim the knowledge of the Word of God and the history of His Church upon earth; these vast territories won for the sciences, the arts, the manufactures;

---

[6] Cf. Monier Williams, *Buddhism*, 1889, pp. xiv to xviii.

[7] In 1801, out of every 1,000 persons on the globe, 129 are estimated to have been English-speaking. In 1883 the proportion was 271 to the 1,000. Every other European language shows a marked decrease in the ratio, except German, which has been about stationary. Cf. Mulhall's *Dictionary of Statistics*, 1886, p. 275.

'That the future of civilisation is in the hands of the English-speaking race is as sure as any unaccomplished fact can be.' See interesting calculation by Mr. Arnold-Forster, from which this result is deduced, in the *Nineteenth Century*, Sept. 1883, vol. xiv. pp. 386–401.

this accumulation of immense wealth in the hands of the few; this spread of political power among the many; these social and political questions which are everywhere pressing for solution at our hands; above all, this seething medley of all religions and no religions—Platonists, and Philonians, and Gnostics, and Docetists, teachers from the far East, teachers from the far West, spiritualism—that credulity of the incredulous—magical arts, luxury, voluptuousness, sensuousness—what does it all mean?

A nineteenth-century Ephesus.

Are we living in a nineteenth-century Ephesus? Have we present with us every element of the Ephesus of the first century on a wider, grander scale? But where are the S. Paul and the S. John, the translators of truth into truth? Are they with us in very deed in the Church they helped to found, and in the Gospel they preached? Are their very writings read in the Church to-day? We answer 'Yes;' but the answer is half-hearted, for we must confess that these writings are not being fully translated and read in the thought and language of the nineteenth century, and that men often cannot understand them, and therefore think that they belong to another sphere of being and have nothing to do with their own real life.

Relation of Universities to this problem.

And are not the Universities—*Universitates*, what a wide width of meaning in the very name!—the foundations of our spiritual ancestry to promote 'true religion and sound learning,' the very eyes of this our great empire—eyes of the intellect, eyes of the spirit—to look forth on the vast world which lies before them, and then to look within into the treasury of God richly stored with all the fulness of truth which has been gathered in all these centuries of life? And are they not to utter the voice, the word, spoken, written, printed, which shall in our English language, the chosen vessel of God, proclaim the truth of heaven to meet the wants of man? Have not men who live physically and mentally on the circumference of this great circle of English and English-speaking humanity, the right to look to its centres for the illumination which they have received from God? Have we not the right to ask that our spiritual guides, the Bishops and Fathers of our Church, and our intellectual guides, the *Patres Conscripti* of our commonwealth of thought, will lead us, as they alone have the right to lead, as they alone have the power to lead?

Army waiting for leaders.

There is a vast army ready to a man to follow, even to the death, if they could be but quite certain that the voice which cries 'Forward' is a voice which has the right to speak, and does speak, in the name of eternal truth, in the name of the eternal God! Is it answered, 'That voice can only come from the Truth, who is the very Word of God. He is the Interpreter of the Father. Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid'? Yes! a thousand times yes! But the church at Ephesus was not only a foundation, but a growth. Not more diverse were the materials of metal, wood, stone, jewels; nor more varied the forms in each component part of the great whole which grew together and made the temple of Ephesus the glory of Asia. This infinite variety serving to form unity in the master-builder's hands, this growth to completeness, this sacred shrine of the deity, is made, when every part is thought of as endowed with life, to represent to us the Church of the living God. The members of it are spoken of as 'fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God, being built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the chief corner stone; in whom each several building, fitly framed together, groweth into a holy temple in the Lord.'[8] 'Jesus Christ is the same, yesterday, to-day, yea, and for ever.' 'God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.' The Gospel according to S. John was not the less divine, because it was the Gospel of the close of the first century, and not the Gospel of the earlier decades. It was not the less divine because it met the philosophical needs of men of its own day, and did not speak in the tones of another period. It was not the less divine, because it was the Gospel of Ephesus, which Ephesians needed; and not the Gospel of Galilee, which they did not need, which they could not have understood, and for which they would not have cared. Is it answered: 'But S. John was specially inspired for this special work, and although we believe in the presence of Christ and of the Holy Spirit in the Church, we cannot add to the sum of Apostolic and divine truth'? Quite so; but this very truth, which is God's fullest revelation to the world, is in a language—I do not mean of word, but of thought—which is to thousands, millions of our brother men, either dead because they cannot understand it, or rejected because it seems to be opposed to other forms of thought which they believe to be true. It is not addition, it is not diminution, it is not substitution, it is not change of essence, it is *translation*, for which the plea is made.

---

[8] Ephes. ii. 19–21.

Difficulty of the task.

And this translation of thought is one of the hardest tasks of life. It requires a full and intimate knowledge of the system from which, and of the system into which, you would translate. And yet men sometimes attempt the task with a knowledge of only one, or it may be of neither, system. And so we have gospels for England, gospels for the nineteenth century, which may have much of the Gospel and very little of the nineteenth century, or may have much of the nineteenth century and very little of the Gospel ; or may, as is too often the case, have very little of the Gospel or of the nineteenth century. And yet these are taken to represent our teaching and our faith. Men who might have special gifts for such a task shrink from it, for they see more clearly than others how full it is of danger and of difficulty. It is not for them, they think : it is for their leaders. And if here and there a rarely gifted soul has felt called of God to make the attempt, his work has had the stamp of no authority. Our own Church and universities have now no formal *imprimatur* for the works of their individual sons; but they often have a very real *Index prohibitorum*, or at least *expurgandorum*. A translation must necessarily differ in form from the original; how easy it is to think, and how much easier to say without thinking, that the substance differs too! How easy to start the suspicion of heresy, to let loose the not always chained but always blind passions of party-feeling and prejudice, to sully, by dragging it into the arena of strife, even the pure robe of truth!

Only leaders can lead.

These are problems, the solution of which the Church and the age would alike accept without demur from those who are their acknowledged representatives, but no one else can hope to solve them. These are difficulties in which none but leaders can lead; for only leaders can build the present upon the great past, only leaders can mould the present into a greater future. The popular opinion which is born of the present is to be formed, and not to be obeyed; but only leaders can form it. Never I believe were there more apparent difficulties, never fewer real ones than to-day. Never were there so many influences for right and truth and God, running parallel to each other, sometimes crossing and thwarting each other, always and quite unnecessarily falling short of the united force of a great army banded together for the service of the Lord of Hosts.

I do not speak without consciousness of, or without thankfulness for, much that has been, that is being done. I come from a diocese to which Oxford has given a Butler and a Van Mildert, to which Cambridge has given a Lightfoot and a Westcott. These are but examples. England, India, the Colonies, America, the Mission field could tell of many like instances, and of the responsive touch of humanity to every gift of higher spirit, and thought, and life. The English-speaking world is not unmindful, for example, of the boon of a translated Bible, nor of many individual efforts to interpret it; but the great problem of translation, in all the width of its meaning, still lies before us at every step, and there are to-day large numbers of earnest inquirers after truth outside the building of the Catholic Church, which should be the teacher of all truth, because they are groaning beneath 'heavy burdens, and grievous to be borne'; while they who 'sit in Moses' seat' themselves 'will not move them with one of their fingers.' These difficulties are but spectres which haunt the darkness of ignorance, and would vanish before the light of knowledge. And is not God saying in the presence of this intellectual darkness and moral chaos, 'Let there be light'? Is not the Church, the body of the Incarnate Logos, to be the Light shining in darkness? *Dominus illuminatio mea.* Yes; and the darkness shall overcome it not.

Leaders must lead.

I have endeavoured to state a problem which arises out of, though it is much wider than, my subject, and constantly confronts Christian people in their daily work. I have no qualification for solving it;

but I have ventured to express it in the presence of those who have every qualification. It must become more and more acute. The enemy is loud in assertion. His forces are kept upon the stage, and they therefore seem to be much more numerous and powerful than they are. But many of our volunteers, and some of our regulars, have been disheartened by uncertainties, divisions, falterings in our own camp. The enemy will not hurt us; but we may hurt ourselves. Leaders must lead if the victory is to be won. Yes: in our philosophy and our criticism, our polity and our action, leaders must lead.

Hints for younger hearers.

And as I have no qualification for solving this problem, I shall make no attempt to do so; but I shall seek to suggest to my younger brethren for their individual help, some lines on which each may for himself work out a course of inquiry, which will lead him to see that the Fourth Gospel is as truly a Gospel for the nineteenth century as it was for the first, and that in the translation of it into modern thought and speech lies the answer to the problems of life.

Characteristics of present-day thought.

Now what are the characteristics of the thought of the nineteenth century which lead men to assert that the doctrines of the past, and especially those of the Fourth Gospel, must give way before them?

I am not a 'man of science,' and I can only judge by what I read in books, or what men who know are good enough to tell me. But I am told that among the great intellectual products of this age are what is called the law or principle of conservation of energy, the law or principle of biogenesis, the law or principle of the molecular constitution of matter, and, chiefest of all, the law or principle of evolution ;[9] though signs are not wanting, as the meetings of the British Association at Manchester and Newcastle-on-Tyne have reminded us, that even now we are far from finality.[1] I have used the term 'principle' as a synonym for 'law' here, because I want the youngest among us to be free from the fallacies which are connected with this very ambiguous word. There is of course nothing of the sense of command or authority about it. We ought not to be led to think and speak of it—though men do ; they write it with a big initial letter, and then feel it is something greater than themselves, a link between them and a higher Force or Energy, like the æons of the Gnostics—but we ought not to think of it as anything more than a convenient expression for a generalization from a number of separate instances. Such a generalization may or may not be valid; but, with imperfect human knowledge, it can of necessity have no claim to finality. It may hold for many years or for centuries, as some such generalizations

Law and principle.

---

[9] Cf. Professor Huxley's interesting sketch of the progress of *Science* in the *Reign of Queen Victoria*, edited by Mr. Humphry Ward, 1887, vol. ii. pp. 322-387 ; and *The Advance of Science*, three sermons preached in Manchester Cathedral during the meeting of the British Association, in 1887.

[1] Cf. *Reports*, 1887 and 1889, and Weismann, *Essays on Heredity*, Eng. Trans. 1889. And see Dawson, *Modern Ideas of Evolution*, 1890.

have held in the course of history, and then resolve itself into a higher generalization. While it lasts it is a very convenient mode of expression ; it is necessary for the arrangement of, and for the progress of science ; but it has no binding authority, and it has no power to explain the admitted facts which it tabulates. There are *Idols* even of the museum, and one of them is to suppose, or to speak as though it were supposed, that to find for an observed phenomenon its own place under an acknowledged law, is to explain it. If the law has a long and difficult name, many of us are half-frightened by it, and are perhaps not honest enough to admit our seeming ignorance, which may be much nearer to true knowledge than the long name is, and we do not dare to ask what it means, what is there behind it, how does it explain the phenomena which it embraces. But if we ask these questions, and keep asking them until we get at the substance of the answers to them, we shall find that to express a phenomenon in the terms of a higher law, is not so much to explain it as to group it with a large number of other phenomena all waiting for their explanation.

Scientific laws not ultimate.

Nor should even the youngest of us be left to suppose that there is any such absolute agreement in the expression of these laws, as the assumed infallibility of some popes of modern science would have us think. Here, as elsewhere, contradictions of successive popes, or even in the course of the reign of the same pope, are difficult to reconcile with any claim to infallibility. As general councils have erred, so scientific councils have certainly erred, and what the primer of the school-boy will soon scorn to teach, has been held by the leaders of science, and has been expressed even in our own day from presidential chairs. No one knows so well as the truly scientific leader that his work is to collect, arrange, tabulate, re-arrange, group in higher unities, the facts of existence; but that of the ultimate explanation of them, he has not even a syllable to speak. The admitted facts of modern science are infinitely greater in number than those of the ancient world; the classes into which they are distributed are fewer and more universal, but when you ask to go behind the colossal cases of this museum of the world, and inquire what it all means, you have got no answer which takes you further than—I am not sure you have any which takes you so far as—the voices which came from Greece, from Alexandria, and the far East, and which may have been heard in Ephesus eighteen hundred years ago.

The Fourth Gospel and our present 'laws.'

These laws which are said to be the chief scientific products of our own time, may or may not be ultimately true. They are probably—let us remove every qualification and suppose that they are absolutely—the highest expression which the world has ever received of the facts of existence—and let us ungrudgingly thank the patient investigators of these and other days. Admit that the museum of the universe is rightly labelled, and then, sitting down before any one of its vast cases, open the Fourth Gospel and read it. Read it just as you would read any other book. Read in the light of Philo and other forms of first-century thought, and then in the light of nineteenth-century thought, the first sentence 'In the beginning was the Word.' Do you find it difficult to translate? Shall that greatest of modern thinkers, Goethe, make Faust help you?

'Tis written: 'In the Beginning was the *Word*,'
Here am I balked: who, now, can help afford?
The *Word*?—impossible so high to rate it;
And otherwise must I translate it,
If by the Spirit I am truly taught.
Then thus: 'In the Beginning was the *Thought*.'
This first line let me weigh completely,
Lest my impatient pen proceed too fleetly.
Is it the *Thought* which works, creates, indeed?
'In the Beginning was the *Power*,' I read.
Yet, as I write, a warning is suggested,
That I the sense may not have fairly tested.
The Spirit aids me: now I see the light!
'In the Beginning was the *Act*,' I write.[2]

Or read again, 'In him was life, and the life was the light of men. And the light shineth in darkness, and the darkness overcame it not.' Or again, 'He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not.' Read these and other words such as these from the first-century Gospel, as you stand before the museums of nineteenth-century science. You need not remove the labels from your cases. You may keep for the present *Biogenesis*, *Conservation of Energy*, *Molecular Matter*, *Evolution*; but you can engrave the truths of the one Eternal *Law*, *Power*, *Life*, *Light*, *Force*, *Energy*, *Act*, *Thought*, *Word*,—GOD,—over the portals and upon the foundations of the universe.

---

[2] Goethe, *Faust*, i. scene 3, Bayard Taylor's translation.

No plea for the temporary expression of theology or science.

You may find it difficult, impossible, to translate into modern scientific expression some of your own ideas as to creation. You may have to see that anthropomorphism is only a necessary form of a childish state of thought, and that God is not a colossal human giant, man made large and made divine. You may have not only to translate S. John, but to sacrifice your former self, unworthy of your higher self and unworthy of your God.

I am not pleading that the puerilities of childhood, or the temporary expressions—scientific or theological—of any age, should be retained. I am pleading for the thankful acceptance of every recognized fact of scientific truth. I am pleading that truth revealed in the book of the universe, cannot oppose truth revealed in the book of inspired humanity. Collect your facts, establish your laws, write your labels, study your museums. Nay; they are too small; study nature in the great physical world; realize the awful immensity of that before which you stand; multiply immensity by immensity as telescope or microscope, or a developed sense, or higher

The immensity of nature.

trained faculty, brings other worlds within your grasp and . . . .

. . . . . .

Are you hushed into silence and dare not speak, and hardly dare to hear? And if you still must hear, for there must be an origin of being, and turn to the masters of science expecting an explanation, they too are dumb. Who are the modern leaders of humanity whom science bids us hear in this darkness of impenetrable mystery?

Scientific leaders dumb before it:

Is Mr. Herbert Spencer one? He can but re-assert it:—

Spencer,

> The production of matter out of nothing is the real mystery. . . .[3]

Is Professor Tyndall?

Tyndall,

> It [Evolution] does not solve—it does not profess to solve—the ultimate mystery of this universe. It leaves in fact that mystery untouched. For granting the nebula and its potential life, the question, whence came they? would still remain to baffle and bewilder us. At bottom, the hypothesis does nothing more than 'transport the conception of life's origin to an indefinitely distant past.'[4]

Is Mr. Darwin?

Darwin,

> The mystery of the beginning of all things is insoluble by us.[5]

Is Professor Clifford?

Clifford,

> My conclusion then is, that we do know, with great probability, of the beginning of the habitability of the earth,

---

[3] *First Principles*, ed. 4, 1880, p. 34.

[4] *Scientific Use of the Imagination*, ed. 3, 1872, p. 37.

[5] Cf. Aubrey Moore, *Evolution and Christianity*, 1889, p. 7.

about one hundred or two hundred millions of years back, but that of a beginning of the universe we know nothing at all.[6]

Asa Gray.

Or, lastly, shall we inquire of Dr. Asa Gray, the American botanist, the friend and correspondent of Darwin, who describes his own position as—

> one who is scientifically, and in his own fashion, a Darwinian, philosophically a convinced theist, and religiously an accepter of the 'Creed commonly called the Nicene,' as the expression of the Christian faith.

Can his philosophy cast any ray of light on this abysmal gloom?

'Origination' the essential thing.

> Thus the selection and preservation, and we may say the eduction, of the actual forms and adaptations, may be scientifically accounted for, but not their origination.
>
> The origination is the essential thing.[7]

Yes: *the origination is the essential thing.* And all our modern philosophers are without a word to speak in the presence of the essential thing. But while philosophy is dumb, you feel that there must be, there is, a voice which speaks. The yearning faculties of humanity cannot be for ever yearning, and never satisfied . . . .[8]

---

[6] *Lectures and Essays*, ed. 2, 1886, p. 156.

[7] *Contemporary Review*, April 1882, p. 606.

[8] 'Those, then, who believe, as Christians do, that God is the Creator of heaven and earth, hold a view which, whether it is true or not, touches a question on which evolution is wholly silent; so that, as Professor Huxley puts it, "Evolution does not even come into contact with theism considered as a philosophical doctrine."' Aubrey Moore, *Evolution and Christianity*, 1889, p. 7. I owe the greater part of these references to Mr. Moore, and I

Science is dumb, but in its awful silence Faith hears. Where man dare not speak, God does speak. *Tolle, lege. Tolle, lege.* Open your Fourth Gospel. Read :—

The Fourth Gospel.

> In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him ; and without him was not anything made that hath been made.

The Incarnation the only explanation of existence.

The only basis for the intellectual explanation of existence, is for the nineteenth century as it was for the first, the λόγος τῆς ζωῆς, the *Logos* who is *Zöe*, the revelation of life. ‘No man hath ever yet seen God : God only begotten in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.’

Modern ethical science.

Or, again, is it characteristic of modern ethical science to teach that the highest good, the *summum bonum* of human life, is to be found in the development of every faculty of human nature ; that the standard of right and wrong is not happiness or utility, but the categorical moral imperative whose every command must be implicitly obeyed?[9] It

The categorical

---

thankfully embrace the opportunity of expressing my deep sense of the services rendered by that acute thinker—taken from us, alas! too soon—both to theology and science. Cf. *Science and the Faith*, 1889, pp. 162 sqq. ; *Evolution and Christianity*, 1889 ; and *Recent Advances in Natural Science in their Relation to the Christian Faith*, a paper read at the Church Congress at Reading in 1883.

[9] ‘The good has come to be conceived with increasing clearness, not as anything which one man or set of men can gain or enjoy to the exclusion of others, but as a spiritual activity in which all may partake, and in which all must partake, if it is to amount to a full realisation of the faculties of the human soul. And the progress of thought in individuals, by which the conception of the good

imperative. might be an interesting subject for investigation to trace how far modern impulses and standards of morality are an unconscious reflection of the light of revelation, or how far, on principles of development, they are to be regarded as the outcome of truths which have been received by the race or individuals. But, confining our thoughts for the present to the Fourth Gospel, to the morals of the divine life which it portrays, or to the First Johannine Epistle, which is an ethical addendum to the theological principles of the earlier writing, I confess it does not seem to be difficult to express the thoughts of the first century in the terms of those of the nineteenth, or rather to show that those of the nineteenth century are in their highest development based upon those of the first.

Devotion to duty: Examples.

Men who live at a distance and try to watch the movements of young University life, are perhaps struck with the practical outcome of devotion to duty, more deeply than with anything else. Witness the missions to Calcutta and Delhi, and Central Africa. Witness Toynbee Hall and the Oxford House. Witness School and College missions to the neglected

---

has thus been freed from material limitations, has gone along with a progress in social unification which has made it possible for men practically to conceive a claim of all upon all for freedom and support in the pursuit of a common end. Thus the ideal of virtue which our consciences acknowledge has come to be the devotion of character and life, in whatever channels the idiosyncrasy and circumstances of the individual may determine, to a perfecting of man, which is itself conceived not as an external end to be attained by goodness, but as consisting in such a life of self-devoted activity on the part of all persons.' T. H. Green, *Prolegomena to Ethics*, edited by A. C. Bradley, 1883, p. 309.

masses of our population. Witness the evidences of sympathy, communion, fellowship, with the brotherhood of man. What is their source? A modern altruism?[1] A nineteenth-century gospel of humanity? But these are trees whose chief roots are found in Christian soil, and they have gladdened the earth with the beauty of their blossom and the bounty of their fruits, just as the soil has been watered by the showers of blessing which God has given in these later days to the revived Church in our midst. Read the Gospel of the first century. Read the writings of S. John:—

The true principle.

> God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life.
>
> This is my commandment that ye love one another, even as I have loved you. Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.
>
> But whoso hath the world's goods, and beholdeth his brother in need, and shutteth up his compassion from him, how doth the love of God abide in him?
>
> Little children, let us not love in word, neither with the tongue; but in deed and truth.
>
> We love, because he first loved us.
>
> If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar: for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, cannot love God whom he hath not seen.
>
> And this commandment have we from him, that he who loveth God love his brother also.

There are the principles of your highest life and work. There are the principles which, whether you know it or not, are the spring of all your work, and which, whether men know it or not, the best life and work of our day are translating from the first century into the nineteenth; and there are the principles which alone can make that work both effective and permanent.

---

[1] Cf. *Altruism* in Murray's *New Dictionary of the English Language;* and Herbert Spencer, *Data of Ethics*, 1879, pp. 185 sqq.

Illustrations.

As I was thinking of the modern substitution of ideas which have sprung from Christianity, and which men who shrink from acknowledging Christ Himself are putting forward in the place of Christianity, I took up a book in a house where I chanced to stay, in which I found these words:—

> The Chaplain of a penitentiary records that among the most degraded of its inmates was one miserable creature. The Matron met her with firmness, but with a good will which no hardness could break down, no insolence overcome. One evening after prayers the Chaplain observed this poor outcast stealthily kissing the shadow of the Matron thrown by her candle upon the wall.[2]

The shadow of Christ.

This was the involuntary homage of a fallen and wretched woman; but, Sirs, are men and women in the strength and vigour of intellectual and moral culture to be stealthily kissing the shadow of the humanity of Jesus Christ, cast as it is upon the universe by the light of the effulgence of His Godhead, or are we to be manfully confessing Him to whom we owe our power to work and think? Stealthily kissing a shadow? Nay, we are to be in loving adoration kissing the feet of Him who was pierced and nailed upon the Cross for us.

[2] Bishop of Derry, *The Epistles of St. John*, 1889, pp. 120–121.

Altruism.

Is Love written as 'charity' or disguised as 'altruism' the newly discovered principle of a brotherhood of humanity? Listen to S. John:—

> Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his son to be the propitiation for our sins.
>
> Hereby know we love, because he laid down his life for us: and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren.

Agnosticism.

Or again, to take another example with which these lectures must close, it is characteristic of some educated thought of this century to assert that whether there is a personal God or not, is and must remain a mystery; that there cannot be logical proof that He exists, and that there cannot be logical proof that He does not exist; that the assertions of theism and atheism are alike beyond the province of the human intellect;[3] and that all we can do is to remain in the presence of an unknown and unknowable energy. Agnosticism, for it is a system with a name and leaders and disciples, like one of the hundreds of such theories of the past, has many attractions. The Greek title has something to say for its spread among ourselves; for, as was remarked long ago, many persons would proclaim with an air of superiority in Greek 'I am an *agnostic*,'

Its attractiveness.

Reasons.

---

[3] 'Of all the senseless babble I have ever had occasion to read, the demonstrations of these philosophers who undertake to tell us all about the nature of God would be the worst, if they were not surpassed by the still greater absurdities of the philosophers who try to prove that there is no God.' Huxley, *Science and Culture*, 1881, p. 241.

who would not be equally willing to proclaim in Latin 'I am an *ignoramus*.' Then the fact that it has been adopted by some who are supposed to be leaders of science gives it an attractiveness, a fashion, which has its hold upon weaker minds. It is the correct shade for the season, and it would not quite do for people who are in the circles of modern thought to appear in any other. And above all it is a sort of neutral ground. It asserts nothing positively, and therefore it has nothing to defend. It is the refuge of men of all kinds who have no opinions on the most vital subject possible to thought, or do not quite know what their opinions are, or have not the courage of them, or would like to postpone thinking of them.

Modern use of term,

The special use of the term belongs to our own day.[4] What sort of connexion has the first century with this product of the present? If we study the

S. Paul's and S. John's.

teaching of S. Paul and S. John, we shall see that both the name and reality are much older than we sometimes think. S. Paul found men at Athens dissatisfied with their own idea of the gods, ready to embrace any others, and erecting an altar[5] to a god they could not know, and Him to whose existence their very agnosticism witnessed, he declared unto them. Writing to their neighbours at Corinth, he reminds them that 'in the wisdom of God the world through its wisdom knew not God,'[6] and this agnosticism of worldly wisdom was, it will be remembered, a frequent subject of his teaching. S. John, preaching a Gospel to gnostics and agnostics alike, and meeting the congeries of religious and philosophical seekings after God, of which Ephesus was, as we saw, the centre, declares in most positive terms this agnosticism of human intellectual powers: 'No man hath seen God at any time.' But the agnosticism which in the negation of its own intellectual powers is strictly logical, is in the negation of all outside its powers as strictly illogical. S. Paul and S. John alike preach a Gospel not to the impotence of the human intellect, but to the strength and the needs of the faculty of faith :—

---

[4] Cf. *Agnostic* in Murray's *New Dictionary*, *ut supra*.

[5] εὗρον καὶ βωμὸν ἐν ᾧ ἐπεγέγραπτο ΑΓΝΩΣΤΩ ΘΕΩ. Acts xvii. 23.

[6] ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἔγνω ὁ κόσμος διὰ τῆς σοφίας τὸν θεόν, . . . 1 Cor. i. 21.

Intellectual agnosticism necessarily true.

> For seeing that in the wisdom of God the world through its wisdom knew not God, it was God's good pleasure through the foolishness of the preaching to save them that believe.[7]
>
> No man hath seen God at any time; God only begotten in the bosom of the Father, he hath been the interpreter.[8]

Conclusion without premises

The Fourth Gospel preaches to us, brethren, no system of Gnosis. There is to human intellect no proof of axioms in any science, least of all in the science of the Infinite. If we could be anything more than intellectual agnostics, the science could not be of the Infinite, of the Eternal, of God. But men who profess to be logical make two tremendous leaps in this discussion, for which there cannot be any valid warrant. The first leap is from 'I cannot understand' to 'It cannot be understood.' Who will in

Examples.

---

[7] 1 Cor. i. 21.

[8] John i. 18.

moments of calm thought claim or allow the only *major premise* which supports this conclusion? It is the sort of logic which people learn very easily, but men do not usually admit it when made by any persons other than themselves. You may hear it any day:—

'I *can't* get the answer in the book,' said a little fellow in an elementary school, as he was making his first attempt at vulgar fractions. 'I am sure the book is wrong.' But his certainty only amused.

'I do not see any *not* in my text,' said a well-known Professor of Latin, as one of his pupils was construing in class.

'No, sir, but it won't make sense without,' replied his pupil; but neither the Professor nor the rest of the class were quite convinced.

And yet this illicit process from 'I cannot understand' to 'It cannot be understood' runs through page after page of modern so-called religious, and so-called philosophical writing. If men would but write the *I* of their finite powers as small as it really is, and try to think of what the *I* of Infinite really means, this false reasoning at least would disappear.

The other leap is more wonderful still, for it is opposed to the whole experience and practice of human life. It is that by which a man passes from 'It cannot be understood,' to 'It cannot be believed.' Who will claim or admit any *major premise* which will warrant this conclusion? What proportion of human life depends upon our understanding all that concerns it? What proportion of the events of every day depends upon faith? What, for example, is our understanding of any human being? What our faith? And in the complete absence of understanding, are we not necessarily driven to the assertion of faith? Is not the very intellectual paralysis of agnosticism in the presence of the Infinite, the necessary assertion of a faculty[9] higher than intellect?

Agnosticism is the assertion of faith.

---

[9] 'If philosophy has to explain what is, not what ought to be, there will be and can be no rest till we admit, what cannot be denied, that there is in man a third faculty, which I call simply the faculty of apprehending the Infinite, not only in religion, but in all things; a power independent of sense and reason, a power in a certain sense contradicted by sense and reason, but yet a very real power, which has held its own from the beginning of the world, neither sense nor reason being able to overcome it, while it alone is able to overcome both reason and sense.

. . . . . .

'It is difficult at present to speak of the human mind in any technical language whatsoever, without being called to order by some philosopher or other.

'According to some, the mind is one and indivisible, and it is the subject-matter only of our consciousness which gives to the acts of the mind the different appearances of feeling, remembering, imagining, knowing, willing, or believing. According to others, mind, as a subject, has no existence whatever, and nothing ought to be spoken of except states of consciousness, some passive, some active, some mixed. I myself have been sharply taken to task for venturing to speak, in this enlightened nineteenth century of ours, of different faculties of the mind,—faculties being merely imaginary creations, the illegitimate offspring of mediæval scholasticism. Now I confess I am amused rather than frightened by such pedantry. Faculty, *facultas*, seems to me so good a word that, if it did not exist, it ought to be invented in order to express the different modes of action of what we may still be allowed to call our mind. It does not commit us to more than if we were to speak of the *facilities* or *agilities* of the mind, and those only who change the forces of nature into gods or demons, would be frightened by the faculties as green-eyed monsters seated in the dark recesses of our Self.' Max Müller, *Introduction to the Science of Religion*, 1873, pp. 20, 21.

The Fourth Gospel appeals to the faculty of faith.

It is to this faculty that the Fourth Gospel appeals, and here it approves itself as the Gospel of the nineteenth century as truly as it was that of the first. A Gospel to the knowledge and understanding of the first century could have no word to speak to us to-day, for the partial knowledge of that time has vanished away before the more perfect knowledge of later days, as the partial knowledge of the present shall vanish away before the fuller knowledge of the future. But faith abideth, and to this faith the Gospel speaks, then, now, always :—

> And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: But these are written, that ye might—this is their purpose, not that ye might know, not that ye might understand; but—*believe* that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, and that believing ye might have—not knowledge, not understanding, nothing partial, nothing temporary, but the pulsating fulness of being which is necessarily eternal—*life* in his name.

Lessons for the individual.

This, my brethren, is the divine purpose which caused to be written and to be preserved unto this day the most sacred book in the world. Have you ever read it? I do not mean, Have you read or heard read separate chapters, or have you read portions or the whole, with notes and commentaries, as a subject for intellectual pursuit or examination? But have you ever read it as a whole, as a book written that you might believe? If not, you have missed its whole purpose. It is very short. It was intended for states of uncertainty and problems of doubt; it has met these and solved them in thousands of lives of greatest intellectual strength and attainment, for hundreds of years. Will you read it, that you too may fulfil the divine purpose, and 'believe that Jesus is the Messiah,' in Whom the whole past is fulfilled, that Jesus is 'the Son of God,' in Whom the whole present and future is contained ; the only Interpreter of God to man, in Whom the problems of life are answered and its mysteries solved ; declaring Him in light which dispels all darkness, in truth which drives away all error, in love which dies to overcome hatred, in life which conquers even death ? Will you read it that you in *believing may have life in his name?*

I say, the acknowledgment of God in Christ
Accepted by thy reason, solves for thee
All questions in the earth and out of it,
And has so far advanced thee to be wise.
Wouldst thou unprove this to re-prove the proved ?
In life's mere minute, with power to use that proof,
Leave knowledge and revert to how it sprung ?
Thou hast it ; use it and forthwith, or die !

INDEX

INDEX.

Abbot, Ezra, 17 ; on Justin and Fourth Gospel, 75 *sq.* ; on Drummond, 76 *sq.* ; 268, 336, 375, 380 ; on the *Diatessaron*, 382

Abbott, E. A., views on Justin and the Fourth Gospel, 270 *sq.* ; quoted, 271 *sq.*

Abbott, J. K., 359

Abelard, 152

Aberdeen, University of, 275, 335

Aberklad, 385

Achaia, 116

Achromatism, mental, 8 *sq.*

Ad Autolycum (*To Autolycus*). See *Theophilus*

Addai, Doctrine of, 380

Ad Nationes. See *Tertullian*

Adventurer, The, quoted, 11 *sq.*

Adversus Hæreses. See *Irenæus*

Adversus Marcion. See *Tertullian*

Adversus Praxean. See *Tertullian*

Advocate or judge? See *Bampton Lecturer*

Ælius Aristides, 388 *sq.*

Ælius Publius Julius, 39

Ætians, 117

Africa, 24, 48, 462

'Age, Our,' 3, 166, 169, 173, 409 *sq.*, 411 *sq.* ; period comprised by, 5 ; positive additions to our knowledge in, 357 *sq.*

Agnosticism, 12 ; its attractiveness, 465 ; modern use of term, S. Paul's, S. John's, 466 *sq.* ; intellectual, necessarily true, 467 ; the assertion of faith, 469

Agrippa Castor, opponent of Basilides, 100

Albertus Magnus, 152

Alcuin, 152

Aleppo, 378

Alexander, Bishop, 334 ; quoted, 464

Alexander, empire of, 445

Alexandria, 33, 38, 110, 114 *sq.*, 121, 149, 234, 249, 261, 428, 431, 443, 456 ; Catechetical school of, 20. See *Church* ; *Clement*

Alexis Aristenus, Canon of, 121

Alford, 142, 334

Alogi, the, one apparent exception to reception of Fourth Gospel, 123, 161 ; Harnack and Zahn on, 123 *sq.* ; Hilgenfeld on, 124 ; name appears first in Epiphanius, perhaps borrowed from Hippolytus, 124 ; ascribe Fourth Gospel to Cerinthus, 125 ; doubt as to real existence of, 125 ; evidence of, really tends to confirm Apostolic authorship, 125 *sq.* ; rejection of, by Zeller, 126 ; negative witness of, 127 ; Strauss on, 211

Alsace, 253

Altruism, 463, 465

Ambrose, 151

America, 160, 164, 194, 275, 382, 452

Ammon, 247

Ammonius, Harmony of, 381

Amphilochius of Iconium, his date and connexion with

Gregory, 116 ; his view of the Apocalypse, and testimony to Fourth Gospel, 116 *sq.* ; on the Canon, 117
Amycla, Bishop of, on inspiration, 159
Anastatius of Sinai, quotes the works of Melito, 35 ; his testimony to Melito, 39 ; Canon of, 121
Anselm, 152
Antioch, 117, 121, 186, 399. See *Church* ; *Serapion* ; *Theophilus*
Antoninus Pius, 58
Aphrahat, Homilies of, 380, 384
Apocalypse, the, in Irenæus, 19 ; not included in all versions, 108 ; rejected by Dionysius, 110 ; 113 ; by Cyril, 114 ; by Gregory Nazianzen, 116 ; by Theodore of Mopsuestia, 118 ; included by Athanasius, 115 ; testimony of Amphilochius to, 116 ; no reference to, in Chrysostom, 119 ; testimony of Philaster to, 122 ; not accepted by Greek church, 122 ; Hippolytus on, 124 ; and Caius, 361, 392 *sq.* ; Alogi ascribe it to Cerinthus, 125 ; in Canon of second century, 147 ; Bretschneider on, 183 *sq.* ; Strauss on, 211 *sq.* ; Baur on, 233 ; Hase on, 252 ; Reuss on, 255 ; Sabatier on, 256 ; Weizsäcker on, 257 ; Thoma on, 262 ; Scholten on, 266 ; Tayler on, 267 ; author of *Supernatural Religion* on, 268 ; Abbott on, 272 ; Martineau on, 289 *sq.* ; 291 ; Schleiermacher on, 302 ; Lechler on, 322 *sq.* ; Weiss on, 325 ; 405
Apolinaris of Hierapolis, 34, 102 ; his date, 36 ; lists of his works in Eusebius, Theodoret, Photius, 36 ; other works, 37 ; extracts in *Paschal Chronicle* not undoubted, 37 ; reference to the Fourth Gospel by, 37, significance of writings of, 37 ; their reception by Serapion and other bishops, by Jerome, and Socrates, 39 *sq.* ; Strauss on, 210 ; Martineau on, 288
Apollos, 249, 411, 428
Apology, of Tertullian, 22 *sq.*, 63 ; of Theophilus, 29 *sq.* ; of Athenagoras, 63 ; to Antoninus, 35, 408. See *Justin Martyr*
Apostles, the, named by Clement of Alexandria, 21 ; by Tertullian, 24 *sq.* ; by Justin, 65 *sq.*, 67 *sq.* ; by Papias, 96
Apostolic Canons, list of, 121 ; 373
Apostolical Constitutions, the, quoted, 111 ; reference to Gospels in, 111 ; Epiphanius on, 117
Aquileia. See *Rufinus*
Aquinas. See *Thomas*
Aristides. See *Ælius*
Arius, 127
Arnold, Matthew, 13 ; on Hippolytus and Basilides, 101, 371 *sq.*, 373 ; on Gnosticism, 101 ; quoted, 222
Arnold, Thomas. See *Bunsen*
Arnold-Forster, 446
Arsenius the monk, Canon of, 121
Arsenius Sukrean, 407
Arsinoë. See *Egypt*
Articles, 156
Asia Minor, 20, 37, 39, 41 *sq.*, 48, 102, 186, 200, 206, 234, 248 *sq.*, 252, 256, 260, 265 *sq.*, 295, 321, 358, 388 *sq.*, 425, 428 *sq.*, 433, 449. See *Church*
Assemani, 381, 385
Astié, 334
Athanasian, pseudo-, synopsis, 121
Athanasius, his date and representative position, 114 ; identity of his Canon with our own, 114 *sq.* ; its inclusion of the Apocalypse, 115 ; Didymus, Gregory Nazianzen, and, 115 ; Epiphanius and, 117 ; Rufinus and, 122
Athenagoras, his position as an Apologist, 63 ; *Apology* of, to Marcus Aurelius, 63 ; use of Justin, 69 ; Strauss on, 210
Athens, 108, 466. See *Church*
Athos, Mount, 359

Aubé, quoted, 58 *sq.* ; on date of Polycarp's martyrdom, 390
Aucher, and the *Diatessaron*, 382
Auckland, 163, 165
Augustine, his date and commentary on the Fourth Gospel, 122 *sq.*, ; on authority of the Church, 149 *sq.* ; on authority of the Scriptures, 150 ; 151
Augustus, empire of, 445
Aurelius Cyrenius, 39. See *Marcus Aurelius*
Ayasalouk, 427

Babrius, 360
Bacchius, 53
Bacon, quoted, 16 ; 152, 351
Bampton, John, will of, 16
Bampton Lecturer, 14; if an advocate or judge, 15 *sq.* ; 42 *sq.*, 73, 335
—Lectures, quoted, 42 *sq.*, 131, 177
Bar-Hebræus, 121
Bar-Kochba, 261. See *Justin Martyr*
Barnabas, Epistle of, 97 ; Johannine influence in, 143, 402 ; Bretschneider on, 185 ; Holtzmann on, 260 ; 358
Bar-Salîbî, on the *Diatessaron*, 381 ; quotes Ephraim, Ammonius, and Elias, 381 ; his Syriac *Commentary*, 392, 393
Basel, University of, 248
Basil, 149
Basilides, 102 ; and Hippolytus, 89, 100 *sq.*, 364–373 ; and Papias, 100 ; his date questioned, 100 ; De Groot and Scholten on date of, 100 ; Arnold and Renan on Hippolytus and, 101 ; Strauss on, 209 ; Bunsen, Keim, Renan and Arnold on Fourth Gospel and, 370–373 ; which is the true ? 365 *sq.* ; Hort and Renan on, 366 *sq.* ; contains quotations from Fourth Gospel, 368–373 ; and meaning of φησίν, 368 *sq.*, 370 *sq.* ; 410
Bäthgen, 379, 384
Bauer, Bruno, view of the Messianic idea, 216 ; 235
Baur, 5, 17, 75 ; and the Clementines, 84 ; and Strauss, 192 *sq.*, 197 *sq.*, 200, 203, 205, 212 *sq.*, 214 *sq.*, 217 *sq.*, 219 *sq.*, 223 *sq.*, 225, 228, 230 *sq.*, 232, 234 ; quoted, 177, 194, 224–231, 364 ; early years, 223 ; life at Blaubeuren and Tübingen, 223 *sq.* ; evangelical sympathies, 223 *sq.* ; influence of Schleiermacher and Hegel on, 224 ; extent of literary work, 225 ; list of books, and shorter writings, 225 *sq.*, 227 *sq.* ; his method of investigation, 228 *sq.* ; his view of the Pauline Epistles, 229 *sq.* ; on the Canon, 230 ; his treatment of Johannine question, 230 *sq.*, 234 ; Fourth Gospel a 'tendency-writing,' 230 *sq.*, 422 *sq.* ; and the Gospels, 231 *sq.*, 423 *sq.* ; application of theory of tendency to theory of myth, 232 ; stages of development and the documents, 233 *sq.* ; his followers, 234 *sq.*, 236 *sq.* ; and the Hegelian *Left*, 237 *sq.* ; his theory an arch, 238 *sq.* ; the arch tested, its foundations doubted, 239 *sq.* ; the workmen, Volkmar, Hilgenfeld, Ritschl, and Holsten, questioned, 240 *sq.*, 242 *sq.* ; the arch a ruin, 244 ; 246, 250, 253, 257, 265, 281 *sq.*, 335 ; Neander on, 306 ; 308 *sq.*, 313 *sq.*, 319, 322, 324, 330, 347, 349 ; on the *Philosophumena*, 363 *sq.* ; on Hippolytus, 366 ; on the Clementines, 374 ; 409
Baumgarten-Crusius, 334
Baxter, on inspiration, 159 *sq.*
Bec, school of, 152
Bede, 152 ; his devotion to the Fourth Gospel, 162 *sq.* ; his last days, 162 *sq.* ; compared with Lightfoot, 164 *sq.*; 439
Belfast, 275
Belsheim, 359
Bengel, 193, 224
Berlin, 177, 192 *sq.*, 236, 238, 240, 257, 300, 305, 307 *sq.*, 310, 313 *sq.*, 318, 323, 361

Bernard, 357
Bert. See *Aphrahat*
Bertholdt, 184
Beyschlag, 325; views on the Fourth Gospel, 329 *sq.*
Bible, the, use of term by Chrysostom, 120; 130, 132 *sq.*, 135 *sq.*, 147, 149, 151; verbal inspiration a new departure in history of, 156 *sq.*; external infallibility of, attacked by modern criticism, 157; a weapon of Protestant against Roman, 156 *sq.*; neglect of, in last century, 176 *sq*; 301; new translation of, 452
Blaubeuren, Strauss at, 191 *sq.*; Baur at, 123 *sq.*, 236
Bleek, 300, 309; his position, 313 *sq.*; on the Fourth Gospel, 314 *sq.*; and De Wette, 314; Mangold's ed. of, 314 *sq.*, 342; and Ebrard, 317; no reference to Lightfoot and Westcott by, 342; quoted, 200, 262
Bodenstein of Carlstadt, treatment of the Scriptures by, 153
Bodleian Library, 393
Boehme, 192
Bologna, University of, 152
Bonaventura, 152
Boniface, 383
Bonn, University of, 262, 310, 313
Boor, De, 394
Borghesi, on date of Polycarp's martyrdom, 389 *sq.*; on date of martyrdom of Ignatius, 400
Boswell, 351
Boyle, 351
Bradley. See *Green, T. H.*
Bradwardine, 152
Brescia. See *Philaster*
Bretschneider, 5; his life and earlier works, 179; his *Probabilia*, its purpose and scope, 180 *sq.*; his conclusions: discourses largely imaginary, 181; author not the Apostle, nor Palestinian, nor Jew, 182; Gospel sprung from Jewish anti-Christian zeal, 183; cannot be supported from Apocalypse, 183 *sq.*; nor from Epistles, 184; Epistles not proved Johannine, and strengthen adverse views about Gospel, 184 *sq.*; external evidences not sufficient, 185 *sq.*; weight of opposing internal evidence, place probably Egypt, 186 *sq.*; importance of his book, 187; its reception, 187 *sq.*; was convinced by replies, retractation, 'question is settled,' 188, 190; his *Handbook of Dogmatics*, 188; Strauss and, 189, 212; his character in *Autobiography*, 189 *sq.*; his opposition to Schleiermacher and Schelling, 190, 194; 200, 246, 247, 299, 302, 308 *sq.*, 409; on Fourth Gospel and Synoptics, 421 *sq.*, 423; quoted, 179–190, 219
British Association, 454
British Museum, 392, 406 *sq.*
Bruston, 314
Bryennios, 359; ed. quoted, 145
Buddha, the, 429
Bunsen, 86; on mythic histories, 196; Arnold on, 315 *sq.*; on the Fourth Gospel, 316; on the *Philosophumena*, 362 *sq.*; on Basilides, 370 *sq.*
Burgon, 358
Burscough, 357
Busse, on date of martyrdom of Ignatius, 400
Butler, 452
Byzantium. See *Leontius*

CÆSAR, 58, 138
Caius, his testimony to the Fourth Gospel, 111; Jacobi on, 361 *sq.*; Baur and Fessler on, 363 *sq.*; Gwynn on, 392 *sq.*; Hippolytus and his *Heads against Caius*, 392 *sq.*
Calcutta, 435, 462
Calovius, quoted, 136, 156
Calvin, views on the Scriptures, quoted, 155 *sq.*
Cambridge, University of, 17, 43, 152, 176, 250, 338, 366, 452
Campbell, Principal, quoted, 52; 103
Canon, the, history of, 21; of New

Testament, 42; of Old Testament, 38, 141; Origen on, 108 *sq.*; Eusebius and, 112 *sq.*; Athanasius on, 114 *sq.*; Gregory Nazianzus, on, 116; Amphilochius on, 117; Epiphanius on, 117; Theodore of Mopsuestia on, 118; Chrysostom and, 119 *sq.*; of Greek church in Syria in fifth century identical with Peshito, 120; close of, in East, 121, 151; history of, in fourth and succeeding centuries, survey unnecessary as all accept the Fourth Gospel, 121 *sq.*; Syrian, 121; of Hilary, Philaster, and Rufinus, 122; close of, in West, 123, 151; and the Church, 129 *sq.*, 146 *sq.*; a question of history, and not of dogma, 147 *sq.*; reasons of early Church for not providing a Canon, 141 *sq.*, 146 *sq.*; Catholic, necesary, 147; materials of, in second century, 147; tradition, the first formative principle of, 158; accepted on Church authority until Reformation, 151; Luther and, 154; Baur and, 230

Canterbury, Monastic Library at. See *Papias*

Capua. See *Victor*

Caricus. See *Serapion*

Carlisle, Bishop of. See *Goodwin*

Carlyle, 11

Carthage, 33, 38, 108; synods of, 123, 151, See *Church*; *Tertullian*

Caspari, 58, 91

Cassian, 434

Catena, 151. See *Corderius*; *Pattison*

Catholics, acceptance of Fourth Gospel by, 20

Ceillier, on date of martyrdom of Ignatius, 400

Celsus, 127, 185

Centuries. See *Judgment of*

Century, first century, 351; second century, evidence of, 17, 53; deductions from it, 102 *sq.*; third generation of, 18 *sq.*, 102; second generation of, 53 *sq.*, 102; first generation of, 95 *sq.*, 102; second century, 34, 35, 38 *sq.*, 40 *sq.*, 42 *sq.*, 44 *sq.*, 46 *sq.*, 48 *sq.*; position of an apologist in, 62 *sq.*, 64; 97, 101, 120, 147, 351; third, 107 *sq.*, 120, 148; fourth, 112 *sq.*, 120, 148; fifth, 120; sixth, 120; seventh, see *Anastatius*; ninth, 36; evidence of sixteen centuries, 107–166

Cerinthus, 19; Alogi ascribe Fourth Gospel and Apocalypse to, 125; Jacobi on, 361; Renan on, 411; and S. John, 434, 436

Ceylon, 435

Charlemagne, empire of, 445

Charteris, 17, 336, 402

Cheshunt College, 336

Chillingworth, 135

Christiania. See *Caspari*

Chronicon. See *Eusebius*

Chronicon Paschale, 400

Chrysostom, John, his date and writings, 119 *sq.*; constant use of Fourth Gospel, but no reference to Apocalypse, 119; other works printed with his, 119 *sq.*; Scriptures are to him *Biblia*, 120; 149; on Ephesus, 428

Church, 8; of Lyons, 18, 47; of Alexandria, 20, 47; of Rome, 12, 22, 47, 82, 152, 156 *sq.*, 158 *sq.*, 336, 363; of Carthage, 22, 47; corporate life of, 24 *sq.*, 47 *sq.*, 70, 97; of Antioch, 27, 47; of Asia Minor, 33, 38, 40 *sq.*, 117, 402; of Rhossus, 40; of Athens, 47; of Corinth, 47; of Ephesus, 47, 144, 185, 402, 428 *sq.*, 448 *sq.*; of Hierapolis, 47; of Sardis, 47; of Edessa, 47, 380; life in early years of second century, 97; of Italy, 108; Syrian, 120, 379; Armenian, 121; Eastern, 108 *sq.*, 110 *sq.*; Ethiopian, 121; Russian, 121; Greek, did not accept Apocalypse, 122; Latin, did not accept Epistle to the Hebrews, 122; Western, 111 *sq.*, 122, 379 ; and Bible, 147, 155 *sq.* ; Lutheran, 156, 253, 326 ; authority of, a reason for accepting Fourth Gospel, 128 *sq.* ; and Scripture, 130 *sq.*, 132, 137 ; early, did not provide a Canon, 141 *sq.* ; had no need at first for a Canon 146 ; writing not included in special gifts to, 140 ; each, its own teachers and Gospel, 146 ; Catholic idea of, not yet realized, 145 ; depends upon the Scriptures, 149 ; Augustine on authority of, 149 *sq.* ; Jerome on authority of, 150 ; and the council of Trent, 155 ; has never accepted a mechanical, verbal inspiration, 157 *sq.* ; Protestant churches of Germany, France, Holland, America, 160 ; and the Fourth Gospel, 161 *sq.* ; English, 164, 446, 452 ; and the promised Comforter, 418 ; fourfold form of one Gospel received by, 421 ; width of, 443 ; many still outside, 452 ; and the Logos, 452

Ciasca, on the *Diatessaron*, 385 *sq.*, 387 ; and the *Ignatian Epistles*, 396 *sq.*

Cicero, quoted, 180

Clarendon Press, the, 360, 364

Clement of Alexandria, 97, 102, 438 ; his date, origin, teachers and pupils, 20 *sq.* ; his *Stromateis*, quoted, 20 *sq.*, 88, 100 ; his *Protreptikos*, quoted, 22 ; no doubt as to Fourth Gospel, 20, 22 ; his use of Apocryphal writings and gospel of the Egyptians, 21; his *Exhortation to the heathen*, 22 ; his *Paschal Festival* suggested by Melito, 38 ; his teachers probably include Melito, 38 ; testimony of Socrates to, 40 ; his witness to S. John, 48 ; *Excerpta Theodoti* and *Doctrina Orientalis*, ascribed to, 86 ; witness to Heracleon, 88 ; and Theodotus, 92 ; and Basilides, 100, 365, 367; quoted, 434, 439

Clement of Rome, *First Epistle* of, quoted, 31, 85, 137 ; Johannine influence in, 143, 402 ; *Second Epistle* of, 145 ; Bretschneider on, 185 ; 254, 338

Clementines, the, quote the Fourth Gospel, 83 *sq.*, 374 *sq.* ; their probable date, 84 *sq.* ; views of De Lagarde, author of *Supernatural Religion*, Strauss, Hilgenfeld on, 83 *sq.* ; the value of their evidence, 84 *sq.*, 102 ; their antagonism to S. Paul, and S. John, 85 ; their origin, 84 *sq.* ; Strauss on, 208, 210 ; Volkmar on, 236 ; Hilgenfeld on, 242 ; Martineau on, 288 ; 349, 358 ; our knowledge of, 373 ; Dressel's discovery and, 374 ; Zeller and, 375

Clericus, 373

Clermont. See *Manuscripts*

Clifford, quoted, 459 *sq.*

Clough, quoted, 106

Cludius, 184

Codex א, 358

Codex Borgianus, 387

Codex Claromontanus, 112

Codex Fuldensis. See *Ranke*

Codex Holmiensis, 358

Codex Sangallensis, 358

Codex Tischendorfianus iii., 358

Colbertine. See *Manuscripts*

Colonies, the, 452

Constantia, 117

Constantine, 112

Constantinople, 114 ; Trullan council of, 121 ; council of Greek church at, 121, 151. See *Photius*

Conybeare. See *Bampton Lectures*

Cook, *Commentary*, 334

Corderius, *Catena* of, 118

Corinth, 466. See *Church*

Corpus Apologetarum. See *Otto*

Cosmas Indicopleustes, Canon of, 121

Cotelier, 373

Cowardly Agnosticism. See *Review, Fortnightly*

Credner, 17 ; on Justin, 57 ; on Eusebius, 113 ; on the Alogi,

125 ; ed. of Bodenstein, 153 ; quoted, 112 *sq.*, 115, 118, 316
Criticism, Modern, 3, 4 ; admits reception of Fourth Gospel at close of second century, 46 ; attacks infallibility of the Bible, 157 ; of 'our age,' 169 *sq.* ; considered in Lectures IV., V., VI. ; said to have cancelled 'judgment of centuries,' 169, 409 ; assertion of, cannot be accepted as proof, 169 ; nor yet originality, 170 *sq.* ; destructive, not sufficent, 172 ; constructive, demanded, 173 ; Strauss and, 211 ; and the Fourth Gospel, 419 *sq.*
  — Negative, position of leaders of, 8, 299 ; present school of, 258 ; German, 258–263 ; Dutch, 263–266 ; English, 266–292 ; is self-destructive, 409 ; and question of author of Fourth Gospel, 411 *sq.* ; no consistent body of, 417
  — Positive, 5, 299 *sq.* ; school of, 299–353 ; summary of, 353, 410 ; is to the negative as $\frac{1}{0} = \infty$, 412
Cruice, on the *Philosophumena*, 363, 367
Cureton, 35, 380 ; and the Syriac, 358, 384, 396 *sq.*, 406, 408
Cyprian, opinion of Tertullian, 22 ; use of the Gospels by, 63 ; his date and position, 111 ; his testimony to Fourth Gospel, 112 ; 149
Cyril of Alexandria, 149, 407
Cyril of Jerusalem, his date and position, 113 ; his reception of four Gospels, 113 ; rejection of Apocalypse 114, 115 ; 121, 149
Cyril Lukar, Canon of, 121
Cyrrhus, 381

Darwin, quoted, 459 ; 460
Davidson, 8, 267 ; admits reception of Fourth Gospel at close of second century, 46 ; his position, 272, 274 *sq.* ; his first *Introduction*, 272 *sq.* ; on the newer criticism, 273 *sq.* ; views on the Fourth Gospel, 275 *sq.*, 277, 278 *sq.*, 280, 284 *sq.* ; his second *Introduction*, 278 *sq.* ; views on the Acts, 280 *sq.*, 282 ; criticism on his change of view, 282, 284 *sq.* ; by Schürer, 283 ; 347, 409 ; quoted, 109, 272–282
Dawson, 454
Day, 188
Debeltum. See *Ælius Publius*
De Cultu Feminarum. See *Tertullian*
D'Eichthal. See *Eichthal*
Delff, his position and views on the Fourth Gospel, 292 *sq.* ; compared with Martineau, 293 *sq.* ; quoted, 292–295
Delhi, 462
Demetrian, 63
Demurrer against Heretics. See *Tertullian*
De Præscriptione Hæreticorum. See *Tertullian*
Derry, Bishop of. See *Alexander*
Descartes, 8
De Viris illustribus. See *Jerome*
De Wette. See *Wette*
Dialogue with Trypho. See *Justin Martyr*
Dialectica. See *Galen*
Diana of the Ephesians, 429 *sq.*
Diatessaron, The. See *Tatian*
Dickson, 246
Dictionary of Christian Biography, 19, 28, 41, 86, 90, 119, 362, 367, 375, 377 *sq.*, 379, 431
Didache, the, Johannine influence in, 143 ; its title, 145 ; 358 ; supports Johannine authorship, 402
Didymus of Alexandria, his date and position, 115 ; rejects Second Epistle of S. Peter, 115
Dilke, Lady, quoted, 13
Dilthey, 300
Dindorf, and Eusebius, 406
Diocletian persecution, 149
Dionysius of Alexandria, his date, 109 ; his position, and

opposition to Nepos, 110 ; his acceptance of Fourth Gospel and rejection of Apocalypse, 110 ; his view opposed to later criticism, 110 *sq.*
Discussion, tone of, 6
Doctrina Orientalis. See *Valentinus*
Dodwell, 58
Döllinger, Von, letter from, on date of Muratorian Fragment, 45 ; on the *Philosophumena*, 363
Domitian, 394
Donaldson, 28, 37
Dressel, his discovery of part of the Clementines, 374 *sq.*
Drummond, James, on Justin and Fourth Gospel, 76 *sq.*, 78 ; Abbot's opinion of, 76 *sq.* ; quoted, 431
Dublin, 17, 340, 392
Duncker, on Hippolytus, 362 ; and Schneidewin, 89, 101, 362, 367, 369
Duns Scotus, 152
Durham, Bishop of. See *Lightfoot* ; *Westcott*

EASTER, 41
Ebrard, quoted, 200, 334 ; Strauss on, 205 ; Bleek and, 314 ; views on the Fourth Gospel, 317 ; on negative criticism, 318
Ecclesiastical History. See *Eusebius* ; *Socrates*
Eckermann, 247
Edersheim, 431
Edessa, 200, 378, 381. See *Church*
Edinburgh, University of, 17, 336. See *Review*
Egli, on date of Polycarp's martyrdom, 390
Egypt, 20, 48, 86, 108, 114, 186 *sq.*, 386, 430 ; Arsinoë in, 110
Egyptians, gospel of, 21
Eichhorn, 178, 184
Eichthal, D', views on Fourth Gospel, 245
Einsiedel, Von, 188
Eleutherus, 19
Elias of Salamia, 381
Elkesaites, 85
Ellicott, Bishop, *New Testament Commentary* (Watkins), 90, 425, 441, 444
Engelhardt, Von, 76
England, 162, 164, 175, 194, 238, 337 *sq.* ; Queen of, 445 ; spread of English language and rule, 445 *sq.*, 448, 452 ; gospels for, 450. See *Church*
Ephesus, 19, 21, 33, 37 *sq.*, 69, 108, 111, 200, 206, 248, 250, 252, 257, 261, 313, 319, 327, 358, 389, 395, 426 ; life in, 427 *sq.*, 429 *sq.*, 431, 439 *sq.*; city of, 432, 443 *sq.* ; 434 *sq.*, description of, in Acts, 428, 434 ; philosophy and meeting of East and West in, 428 *sq.*, 430 *sq.*, 456, 467 ; a nineteenth-century, 447. See *Church* ; *John* ; *Polycrates*
Ephraim, and the *Diatessaron*, 377, 381 *sq.*, 383 *sq.*
Epiphanius, 57 ; quoted, 85, 87, 125 ; evidence to Ptolemæus, 87 *sq.* ; his date and position, 117 ; his list of the Scriptures, 117 ; his use of term Alogi, 124 ; and Hippolytus, 362 ; and the *Diatessaron*, 378 *sq.*
Erlangen, 247, 317, 331
Europe, 162, 315
Eusebius, 69; *Hist. Eccles.*, quoted, 20, 21, 22, 23, 27, 28, 35, 36, 38–42, 85, 91, 94, 96, 99, 100, 109 *sq.*, 145, 206, 403, 408, 434, 439 ; *Chronicon*, quoted, 28, 29, 388 ; his testimony to Tertullian, 23 ; testimony to Theophilus, 27 *sq.* ; his list of Melito's works, 34 *sq.* ; list of Apolinaris' works, 36 ; on letter of Serapion, 39 *sq.* ; on letter to Victor of Rome, 41 ; and Papias, 96, 145 ; silence of, a witness to use of Fourth Gospel, 97 ; his analysis of writings foreshadowed by Origen, 109, 112 ; and Dionysius, 110 ; his date and position, 112 ; his testimo-

ny to Fourth Gospel and the Canon, 112 *sq.*; his copies made for Constantine, 112 *sq.*; and Athanasius, 114 *sq.*; Strauss on, 206 *sq.*, 210 *sq.*; and Hippolytus, 362; and the *Diatessaron*, 377 *sq.*; and date of Polycarp's martyrdom, 388 *sq.*, 390 *sq.*; and Epistle of Polycarp, 403; and Lightfoot, 404 *sq.*; Syriac version of, 406; Armenian version of, 407 *sq.*; and Syriac Apology to Antoninus, 408
'Evangelical Instrument.' See *Tertullian*
Evanson, 5, 8; his career, 174; the *Dissonance* examined, 174 *sq.*; his preference for S. Luke, 174 *sq.*; his work unworthy of its subject, 176; replies to, by Priestley, Simpson, and Falconer, 176 *sq.*; 246, 299, 308, 409
Everett, 11
Ewald, 205, 217, 227; his position and view of Fourth Gospel, 250 *sq.*; Liddon and Westcott on, 251
Excerpta Theodoti. See *Valentinus*
Exegesis, Oxford Professor of. See *Sanday*
Eye, achromatic, 8 *sq.*, 12, 17; impossible, 10

Fables. See *Babrius*
Fabricius, 86
Falconer. See *Bampton Lectures*
Falkener, 482
Farrar, 432
Faust, quoted, 457
Faustina, 389
Fessler, on the *Philosophumena*, 364
Fichte, 177, 240
Field, 407 *sq.*
Fillion, Abbé, 336
Fisher, 335
Flatt, 193
Flavia Neapolis, 53
Flavius Justinus. See *Justin Martyr*
Flavius Vespasian, 53
Florence, 407
Florinus, 392; *Letter to*, 98 *sq.*
Formula Consensus Helvetica, 156
Forster. See *Arnold-Forster*
Fortnightly Review. See *Review*
Four Gospels, in Irenæus, 19, 69; in Clement, 21; identity of Justin's *Memoirs* with, 70; in Origen, 109; in Cyprian, 111 *sq.*; in Cyril, 113; in the *Diatessaron*, 376 *sq.*, 379, 387. See *Tatian*
Fourth Gospel, the, Keim and, 3; modern criticism in relation to, 4, 419 *sq.*; a problem of present-day thought, 4; position of, in second century, 4; evidence to reception of, in second century, 17; accepted as the work of S. John, 40 *sq.*; reception of, independent of date of Versions, 46; use of, by Irenæus, 19 *sq.*, 69 *sq.*; by Clement, 20 *sq.*, 22; by Tertullian, 24; by Theophilus, 29 *sq.*, 31 *sq.*; included by him among 'Holy Scriptures,' and author among 'spirit-bearing men,' 32; referred to by him in connexion with Old Testament, 32 *sq.*; witness to, and reception by churches of Asia Minor, 33 *sq.*, 38, 41; references in Apolinaris to, 37; probably quoted by Polycrates, 42; reception of, at close of second century quite certain, 46 *sq.*; strength of testimony to use of, its extent and unanimity, 47; evidence of Justin to use of, 61, 64; traces of, found in Justin, 65; read in Church services between A.D. 130–140, 70, 81; certainly included in *Memoirs* of Justin, 72 *sq.*; Thoma on Justin and, 73 *sq.*; Hilgenfeld on, 75; Abbot on, 75 *sq.*; Drummond on, 77 *sq.*; Sanday on, 78 *sq.*; Westcott on, 80 *sq.*; quoted by the Clementines, 83 *sq.*; quoted in *Excerpta Theodoti* and *Doctrina Orientalis*, 86; accepted by the

Valentinians and their school, 87 *sq.*, 89 *sq.*, 91 *sq.* ; systems of Valentinus and Ptolemæus imply, 90 ; accepted by Catholics and their school, 90 *sq.* ; unity of testimony to use of, by Catholics and heretics, 91 *sq.* ; Marcion and, 93 *sq.* ; Tertullian and Irenæus on Marcion's rejection of, 93 *sq.* ; cannot be separated from First Epistle, 96, 403 *sq.* ; Ignatius and, 102 ; accepted throughout the second century as work of S. John, 103 ; facts of the reception of, 107 *sq.*; fulness of evidence to use of, in third and succeeding centuries, 107 ; testimony to use of, by Muratorian Fragment, 108 ; by Versions, 108 ; by Origen, 109 ; by Dionysius, 110 ; by *Apostolical Constitutions*, 111 ; by Hippolytus and Caius, 111, 392 *sq.* ; by Cyprian, 111 *sq.* ; by Eusebius, 112 ; included in copies prepared for Constantine, 113 ; use of, by Cyril, 113 *sq.* ; by Athanasius, 114 *sq.* ; by Didymus, 115 ; by Gregory of Nazianzus, 115 *sq.* ; by Amphilochius, 116 *sq.* ; by Epiphanius, 117 ; by Theodore of Mopsuestia, 117 *sq.*, 119 ; by Chrysostom, 119 *sq.* ; undisputed acceptance of, throughout fourth, fifth, sixth, and succeeding centuries, 120 *sq.*, 122 ; Alogi, the one apparent exception to acceptance of, 123 *sq.* ; commentaries of Jerome and Augustine on, 122 *sq.* ; work of Hippolytus on, 124 ; Alogi ascribe it to Cerinthus, 125 ; no real men who attempt to doubt the authenticity of, only whispers of Alogi, 127 ; principles of the reception of, 127 *sq.* ; received as Apostolic throughout Christendom from end of second to end of eighteenth century, 128 ; reasons for acceptance of, now, 128 ; in history of the Church, 140 ; views held by Christians about, 128 *sq.* ; accepted on the authority of the Church, 128 *sq.*, 130 *sq.*, 132 ; accepted on the inner witness, 132 *sq.*, 134 *sq.* ; accepted on verbal inspiration, 135 *sq.* ; accepted on canons of historical and literary criticism, 137 *sq.*, 139 ; evidence for genuineness of, superior to that of other early histories, 138 *sq.* ; a question of history, not of dogma, 139 ; how received in Apostolic age, 140 *sq.* ; no quotation of other portions of New Testament as 'Scripture' in, 142 ; how received in post-Apostolic age, 142 *sq.* ; perfected tradition of Ephesian Church, 144 ; acceptance of, in the *Dark Ages*, 151 *sq.* ; received above all, 152 ; induction as to reception of, from the facts and principles, 161 *sq.* ; and the Church, 161 *sq.* ; comprehension exemplified in width of induction, 161 *sq.* ; Apostolic, and in fullest sense inspired, 162 ; examples of intensity of devotion to, 162 ; results of the 'judgment of centuries' on, 161, 166, 409, 411 *sq.* ; and 'our age,' 173, 357 *sq.*, 409 *sq.*, 411 *sq.* ; commencement of destructive criticism on, 174 ; question of, in Germany in early years of nineteenth century, 178 *sq.* ; Bretschneider on, 181–190, 421 *sq.*, 423 ; Strauss on, 191, 197, 203 *sq.*, 206–216, 423 ; result, 212 *sq.*, 219 ; Lützelberger on, 200 ; Renan on, 219, 421 *sq.*, 423 *sq.* ; Baur on, 228 *sq.*, 234, 239, 422 *sq.*, 424 ; Hilgenfeld on, 242 ; Ritschl on, 243 ; Stap on, 244 *sq.* ; d'Eichthal on, 245 ; and the Partition Theories, 246 *sq.* ; views of Eckermann, Ammon, and Paulus on, 247 ; Schenkel on, 248 ; Schweizer on, 249 ; Tobler on, 249 *sq.* ; Ewald on, 250 *sq.* ; Hase on, 252; Reuss on, 253 *sq.*, 255; Renan on, 255 *sq.*; Sabatier on, 256; Weizsäcker on, 257; Wendt on, 258; Keim on, 259 *sq.*; Holtzmann, H. J., on, 260; Hönig on, 261; Thoma on, 261 *sq.*; Mangold on, 262; Holtzmann on, 262; Scholten on, 264 *sq.*; Tayler on, 266 *sq.*; author of *Supernatural Religion* on, 267 *sq.*; Abbott on, 270 *sq.*; Davidson on, 275 *sq.*, 277, 278 *sq.*, 280, 284 *sq.*; Schürer and, 283, 424; Martineau on, 286 *sq.*, 288 *sq.*, 293 *sq.*; Delff on, 292–295; and the positive school of criticism, 299; Schleiermacher on, 302 *sq.*, 304; Neander on, 305 *sq.*, 307; De Wette on, 309 *sq.*; Lücke on, 310 *sq.*, 312 *sq.*; Bleek on, 314 *sq.*; Bunsen on, 316; Ebrard on, 317; Tholuck and Hengstenberg on, 318 *sq.*; Meyer on, 319 *sq.*, 321; Lechler on, 322 *sq.*; Weiss on, 324 *sq.*; Luthardt on, 326 *sq.*; Godet on, 328 *sq.*; Beyschlag on, 329 *sq.*; Zahn on, 331; Franke on, 332 *sq.*; other positive writers on, 334 *sq.*, 336; value of their testimony, 336; four special witnesses to, 337; Lightfoot on, 343 *sq.*, 345; Westcott on, 345 *sq.*; Salmon on, 346 *sq.*, 348; Sanday on, 348 *sq.*, 350; quoted in Basilides, 368–373; quoted in the Clementines, though denied by Zeller, 374 *sq.*; if included in the *Diatessaron*, 376, 387; Harnack on, 385; importance of date of Polycarp's martyrdom in connexion with, 391 *sq.*; no discoveries oppose Johannine authorship of, 393 *sq.*, 395; fragments of Papias and Hegesippus support it, 394; recent discoveries in connexion with, 357–395; re-investigation of materials in connexion with, 395–409; quoted by Ignatian Epistles, 400 *sq.*; received by Ignatius, 402; and Epistle of Polycarp, 403 *sq.*; and the silence of Eusebius, 404 *sq.*; no body of negative criticism of, which is not self-destructive, 409 *sq.*; suggestions of author of, other than S. John, valueless, 411 *sq.*; attributed to Judas Iscariot by Noack, 412; interpretation of, 417–470; is 'according to S. John,' 417 *sq.*, 419 *sq.*, 444, 449; its inspiration of essence, not of form, 418 *sq.*; contents, not vessel, divine, 419 *sq.*; the treasure of humanity, 420; claims to be a tendency-writing, 423 *sq.*; difference in form of, admitted, 423 *sq.*; difference in discourses of, 424 *sq.*, 426; key to, lies in *translation*, 426 *sq.*, 450; it explains tone and thought of, 442; and opposing views of critics, 444; traditional account of origin of, 438 *sq.*; if Johannine, necessarily Ephesian, 439 *sq.*; and doctrine of the Logos, 440 *sq.*; what it had not, and what it must have had, 443 *sq.*; more than human, 443 *sq.*; fundamental purpose of, 443; divine purpose of, 449 *sq.*; hints to younger hearers on *translation* of, 453 *sq.*; and science, 454–461; and our present 'laws,' 456 *sq.*, 458; reveals the origin of being in the *Logos*, 461; connexion of, with modern ethical science, 462 *sq.*; true principles of life found in, 463 *sq*,; and altruism, 465; and agnosticism, 465 *sq.*; preaches no system of gnosis, 467; appeals to the faculty of faith, 469; its lessons for the individual, 469 *sq.*; belongs to the nineteenth century as to the first, 469; its divine purpose, 469 *sq.*

France, 160, 177, 194, 338

Franke, views on the Fourth Gospel, 332 *sq.*

Frankfort, 201
Friedländer, on date of Polycarp's martyrdom, 390
Fritzsche, 118
Fuller, 375, 379
Funk, on date of Polycarp's martyrdom, 390, 396

Gaisford, 361
Galen, 360
Galilee, 249, 395, 440, 443, 445, 449
Gallandi, on date of martyrdom of Ignatius, 400
Gaul, 48, 86, 186
Gautama. See *Buddha*
Gebhardt, Von, 359; quoted, 28 *sq.*, 34, 41, 69, 143, 331, 380, 390, 394 *sq.*, 402
Generation, third, of the second century, 18; second, 53 *sq.*; first, 95 *sq.*; its meaning often missed, 97
Geneva, 155
Germany, 84, 160; opening years of nineteenth century in, 177 *sq.*; 175, 194, 238, 241, 275, 304, 328, 338, 359
Gervinus, 177
Gieseler, on date of martyrdom of Ignatius, 400
Gladstone, quoted, 168; 425
Gloucester and Bristol, Bishop of, 13
Gnosticism, work against, by Irenæus, 18; and Valentinus, 85; view of Arnold on, 101; 187, 229, 233 *sq.*, 245, 264, 305, 367, 410; in Ephesus, 428, 429; and the Fourth Gospel, 442 *sq.*, 444
Gnostics, 92, 102; acceptance of Fourth Gospel by, 29; 348, 371 *sq.*, 447, 454, 467
Godet, views on the Fourth Gospel, 328 *sq.*; Meyer and, 343
Goethe, quoted, 17, 457
Golgotha, 412
Goodwin, Bishop, on the Bible, 158
Gospels, written and traditional, 143; question of, in Germany in early years of nineteenth century, 178 *sq.* See *Fourth Gospel*; *Four Gospels*; *Matthew's, S., Gospel*; *Mark's, S., Gospel*; *Luke's, S., Gospel*; *John's, S., Gospel*; *Egyptians, gospel of*; *Peter, gospel of*; *Justin and the Gospels*; *Tertullian and the Gospels*; *Cyprian and the Gospels*; *Strauss and the Gospels*; *Baur and the Gospels*; *Schleiermacher and the Gospels*
Gotha, 179
Göttingen, 217, 240, 250, 310, 331, 374 *sq.*
Grabe, 88; on date of martyrdom of Ignatius, 400
Gratry, 251
Gray, Asa, quoted, 460
Great Missionary Success. See *Dilke*
Greece, 20, 48, 430, 445 *sq.*, 456
Green, J. R., quoted, 163
— T. H., quoted, 462
Gregory, 358
Gregory, ed. quoted, 326 *sq.*, 424
Gregory the Great, 151
Gregory of Nazianzus, his date and position, 115 *sq.*; his list of Old and New Testament Scriptures, 116; excludes Apocalypse though quoted, 116; his description of S. John, 116; and Amphilochius, 116; 149
Gregory of Nyssa, 149
Groningen, 100
Groot, De, on Basilides, 100, 368
Guardian, The. See *Review*
Guhl, 432
Gundert, on Hippolytus, 366
Gwynn, 359; on Hippolytus and Caius, 392 *sq.*
Gymnastica. See *Philostratus*

Haarlem, 322
Hadrian, 100, 371
Hagenbach, 177
Hales, Alexander de, 152
Hall, 359
Halle, University of, 177, 240, 318, 329, 332

Hamartolos, 394
Hamburg, 304 *sq.*
Hardenberg. See *Novalis*
Hare, 315, 363
Harnack, 17 ; opinion on Theophilus' *Commentary*, 28 *sq.* ; quoted, 28 *sq.*, 34, 41, 69, 143, 283, 331, 375, 380, 385, 394 *sq.*, 397, 399 *sq.*, 402 *sq.* ; on date of Justin's First *Apology*, 58 ; on the Alogi, 123 *sq.* ; 287, 289, 359, 382 ; on date of Polycarp's martyrdom, 390 *sq.* ; on the *Diatessaron*, 384 *sq.*, 387 ; on Lightfoot, 399 ; on Ignatian Epistles and Polycarp, 399 *sq.* ; on Epistle of Polycarp, 403
Harvard, 17, 76
Harvey, Wigan, 17 ; ed. of *Adv. Hær.*, quoted, 19, 20, 69, 85, 87 *sq.*, 91 *sq.*, 94, 97, 124, 148, 391, 403, 434. See *Irenæus*
Hase, Von, 5, 179, 204, 227 ; views on the Fourth Gospel, 251 *sq.* ; quoted, 198, 247
Hatch, 287
Hausrath, 259
Hawkesworth, quoted, 11
Hawkins, quoted, 131
Hebrews, gospel to the, 186
Hegel, and Strauss, 192 *sq.*, 196 ; and Baur, 224, 237 *sq.* ; and Oxford, 238 ; and development of philosophy, 238 ; 240, 247, 281
Hegesippus, Fragment of, 394
Heidelberg, University of, 236, 248, 257
Heinrici, 86, 90
Heliand, The, 383
Hemphill, 375, 378, 380
Hengstenberg, 193 *sq.* ; views on the Fourth Gospel, 318 *sq.*
Henoch, book of, 185
Heracleon, and Valentinus, 85 ; his date and position, 87 *sq.* ; testimony of Irenæus, Clement, and Origen to, 88 ; his writings, 88 ; and Tertullian, 92 ; Bretschneider on, 186 ; Strauss on, 210 ; Martineau on, 288

Herbart, 240
Herder, 177, 204 ; quoted, 178
Hermas, the *Shepherd* of, 143, 185, 345, 402
Hermathena, the, 392
Herodotus, 138 *sq.*
Hess, 204
Heyne, 195, 216, 315
Hierapolis, 433. See *Apolinaris* ; *Church* ; *Papias* ; *Philip*
Hilary of Poitiers, his date and Canon, 122 ; and Origen, 122 ; 151
Hilgenfeld, 17, 227, 245, 283, 398, 409 ; admits reception of Fourth Gospel at close of second century, 46 ; on Justin and Fourth Gospel, 75 ; on the Clementines, 84, 374 *sq.* ; on Ptolemæus and the Valentinians, 88 ; on Heracleon, 88 ; on the Alogi, 124 ; his works, 235 ; and Baur's theory, 241 *sq.* ; and Volkmar, 242 ; on the *Diatessaron*, 379 ; on date of Polycarp's martyrdom, 390 ; quoted, 125, 219, 242, 266, 381, 394
Hill. See *Johnson*
Hippo, synod of, 123, 151
Hippolytus, pupil of Clement, 20 ; mentions Irenæus and Melito, 38 ; his testimony to use of Fourth Gospel by Valentinians, 89 ; quotes S. John, 89 ; and Irenæus, 91 ; and Basilides, 100 *sq.*, 364 *sq.*, 366 *sq.* ; opinions of Arnold and Renan on Basilides and, 101 ; his testimony to the Fourth Gospel, 111 ; and Philaster, 122 ; and the Alogi, 124 ; his *Syntagma of Thirty-two Heresies*, and work on Gospel and Apocalypse, 124 ; may have derived information from Irenæus, 124 ; Jacobi on, 361 *sq.* ; Duncker on, 362 ; Bunsen, Lommatzsch, Von Döllinger, and others on, 363 *sq.* ; Gwynn on, 392 *sq.* ; his *Heads against Caius*, 392 *sq.* ; quoted, 368 *sq.*

Ὁδηγός, ed. Gretser, quoted, 35, 39
Holland, 160, 359
Holsten, his works, 236; on Baur's theory, 243
Holtzmann, H. J., views on the Fourth Gospel, 260; 287, 315; on Hippolytus, 366; quoted, 131, 234, 258, 264
Holtzmann, O., his views on the Fourth Gospel, 262 *sq.*
Holy Scripture. See *Scriptures*
Homer, 195
Homilies. See *Aphrahat*; *Clementines*
Hönig, his views on the Fourth Gospel, 261; quoted, 372
Horace, quoted, 172
Horne, 285
Hort, 17, 32, 358; on Justin, 57 *sq.*; on Hippolytus and Basilides, 366 *sq.*
Hosmer, 11
Hossbach, 310
Hug, 178
Hugo of S. Victor, 152
Hulsean Lectures. See *Goodwin*
Hume, David, quoted, 11; 284
Hurst, 177
Hutton, 314, 335
Huxley, quoted, 454, 460, 465

Iconium, 116
Ignatian Epistles, the; and Vossian recension, 101 *sq.*; if by Ignatius, connect Fourth Gospel with S. John, 102; Strauss on, 208; Lightfoot on, 395–402; Zahn on, 397; De Pressensé and Harnack on, 399 *sq.*; quote the Fourth Gospel, 400 *sq.*; and Epistle of Polycarp, 402 *sq.*
Ignatius, 97, 102; recent investigations of, 101 *sq.*; Johannine influence in, 143; Bretschneider on, 185; 338, 392; date of martyrdom, 400, 404; seven Letters written by, 400; Fourth Gospel received by, 402
India, 445, 452
Innocent the First, 123
Inquiry, width of, 5
Inspiration, Luther on, 153 *sq.*; Calvin on, 154 *sq.*; Zwingli on, 155; extended to letter of Bible, 156; mechanical verbal, 156 *sq.*; Westcott on, 158; Bishop of Carlisle on, 158; Newman on, 158 *sq.*; Bishop of Amycla on, 159; Baxter on, 159 *sq.*; Neander on, 160; in relation to Fourth Gospel, 418 *sq.*
Instrumentum. See *Tertullian*
Introduction to course of Lectures, 3
Ionian. See *Melito*
Irenæus, his date, 18; bishop of Lyons, 18; work against Gnosticism, *Adversus Hæreses*, 18, 61; quotes *Apology* and *Dialogue* of Justin, 69; his use of the Fourth Gospel, 19 *sq.*, 69; pupil of Clement, 20; mentioned by Hippolytus, 38; his witness to the Fourth Gospel, 48; compared with Justin, 53; unity with Justin, 59, 81; his intimate connexion with and knowledge of Justin, 69 *sq.*, 91; connected with Ephesus, Rome, and Lyons, 69; and identity of term *Gospels* with *Memoirs* of Justin, 72 *sq.*; his testimony to Valentinus, 85, 90 *sq.*; and Ptolemæus and Heracleon, 87 *sq.*, 92; named by Tertullian, 90 *sq.*; and Marcion, 94; and Papias, 96; testimony to Papias and Polycarp by, 97 *sq.*, 99; his *Letter to Florinus*, 98 *sq.*; testimony of Socrates to, 40; 43, 102, 365; and the Alogi, 124; and the fourfold Gospel, 147; Strauss on, 209, 211 *sq.*; Bretschneider on, 185 *sq.*; Lightfoot on, 344 *sq.*; and Polycarp, 391 *sq.*; and Epistle of Polycarp, 403; *Adv. Hær.*, quoted, 19, 20, 69, 85, 87 *sq.*, 91 *sq.*, 94, 97 *sq.*, 124, 148, 391, 403, 434
— Editor of. See *Harvey*
Isidore, 371
Issus, 40
Italy, 20, 48, 86, 116, 338

Jacobi, 177, 300; on the *Philosophumena*, 361 *sq.*; on Hippolytus, 365
Jameson, Mrs., 435
Jarrow, school at, 152, 162
Jebb, 388
Jena, University of, 177, 235, 334, 376
Jerome, on Tertullian, 22; *De Viris illustribus*, quoted, 22, 23, 24, 28, 34, 38, 403; reference to Theophilus by, 28; his list of works by Melito and Apolinaris, 34; quotes Tertullian on Melito, 38; his testimony to Apolinaris and Melito, 40; his date, and commentary on the Fourth Gospel, 122 *sq.*; on church authority in matter of the Scriptures, 149 *sq.*, 151; 362, 435; on Epistle of Polycarp, 403
Jerusalem, 53; council at, 121; 149, 347, 412, 429, 443
Jesuits, 10
John, S., Irenæus on, 19; and the 'spiritual Gospel,' 21; and the robber, 21; named by Tertullian, 25 *sq.*, 27; influence of, in *Apology* of Melito, 35; Fourth Gospel accepted as work of, 41, 43, 46 *sq.*; description of, by Polycrates, 42; life and work of, familiar to many, 95 *sq.*; Polycarp's personal link with, 48, 95 *sq.*, 391; named by Dionysius, 110; described by Gregory Nazianzen, 116; his knowledge of other portions of New Testament writings, but he never quotes them, 142; Bretschneider on 182–85, 421 *sq.*, 423 *sq.*; Lightfoot on school of, 343 *sq.*; Renan on, 421 *sq.*, 423 *sq.*; in fragments of Papias and Hegesippus, 394; 361, 392; and the Gospel, 419, 443 *sq.*, 449; realization of his position, 427 *sq.*; of his work, 434 *sq.*; and teaching, 436 *sq.*; close of his life, 438 *sq.*; and Philo, 431, 436, 441; and Cerinthus, 434, 436; his declaration of the *Logos*, 440 *sq.*; and agnosticism, 466 *sq.* See also *Fourth Gospel*
— *Gospel* of, quoted, 30, 31, 32, 42, 87 *sq.*, 89, 107, 207 *sq.*, 249 *sq.*, 259, 261, 265, 369, 393, 400 *sq.*, 417 *sq.*, 435 *sq.*, 437, 440 *sq.*, 467
— *Epistles* of, 109, 118, 119 *sq.*, 462; quoted, 442; Bretschneider on, 184 *sq.*; Strauss on, 206 *sq.*; Martineau on, 291; witness of Epistle of Polycarp to, 403 *sq.*
— *Revelation* of. See *Apocalypse*
John Damascene, list of, 121
John of Salisbury, 152
Johnson, on testimony, 350 *sq.*
Jonas. See *Dilthey*
Judæa, 249. See *Justin Martyr*
Judas Iscariot, 412
Judge, advocate or. See *Bampton Lecturer*
'Judgment of Centuries,' 3, 4 *sq.* value of, 6; result of, 161 *sq.*, 166, 169, 417; contrasted with 'our age,' 172 *sq.*, 409 *sq.*, 411 *sq.*; considered in Lectures I., II., III.
Julian, 127
Julianus, 389
Jülicher, 394
Junilius, list of, 121
Justin Martyr, 102; *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, quoted, 34, 53 *sq.*, 55, 59 *sq.*, 65 *sq.*, 67, 71; his date and early life, 53; training and conversion, 54 *sq.*, 429; his connexion with a Stoic, Peripatetic, Pythagorean, and Platonist, 54 *sq.*; his ethics of opinion, 55 *sq.*; his writings, 56 *sq.*; two *Apologies* and *Dialogue* certainly genuine, 56; his First *Apology*, its dedication, 58; a defence of Christians addressed to heathen, 61 *sq.*; written at Rome, 69; quoted, 53, 54, 56, 59, 65 *sq.*, 67, 71 *sq.*, 77, 91; his own account of the *Dialogue*, 59 *sq.*; its scene at Ephesus, 69; written at Rome, 69; addressed to Marcus Pompeius, 60; an apology for Chris-

tianity addressed to Jews, 62; his First *Apology* and *Dialogue* only considered, 56; quoted by Irenæus, 69 *sq.*; chronology and dates not accurately known, 56 *sq.*, 58 *sq.*; opinions of Credner, Volkmar, and Hort on, 57 *sq.*; discussion of his date of literary interest, 58; does not affect result, 59; internal evidence of First *Apology* and *Dialogue* as to date, 59 *sq.*; their evidence as to use of Fourth Gospel, 61 *sq.*; Trypho and the war in Judæa, 59 *sq.*; if Trypho is really Rabbi Tarphon, 60; and the Gospels, 61; unity of, with Irenæus, 59; nature of an apology, 61 *sq.*; and position of an apologist in second century, 62 *sq.*; verbal quotation not to be sought in, 63 *sq.*, 72 *sq.*; compared with Tatian, Athenagoras, Tertullian, Cyprian, 63; traces of Fourth Gospel in, 65 *sq.*; recurrence of term *Memoirs* in *Apology* and *Dialogue*, 65 *sq.*, 67 *sq.*, 145; *The Memoirs*, 65; *Memoirs of the Apostles*, 65 *sq.*, 70; *Memoirs of His Apostles*, 66, 70; *his Memoirs*, 66; *Memoirs relate to our Lord Jesus Christ*, 67, 70; *Memoirs composed by His Apostles, which are called Gospels*, 67, 70; *Memoirs which are read on the day called Sunday*, 65 *sq.*, 70; considered as, a written record of the Lord, 67; sacred books, 67 *sq.*; of Apostolic authority, 68; coming from the Lord, 68; his description of the Sunday service, 65, 67 *sq.*; use of his writings by contemporaries and followers, 68 *sq.*; by Tertullian, 68 *sq.*; by Irenæus, 69 *sq.*; his intimate connexion with Irenæus, 69 *sq.*, 91; link with his pupil Tatian, 70; the *Diatessaron* a key to the *Memoirs*, 71, 375 *sq.*, 387; his identification of the *Memoirs* with the Gospels, 71; the *Dialogue* and the term 'Gospel,' 71 *sq.*; one term used for outsiders, another for Christians, 72; this understood by Irenæus, Tertullian, and others, 72; Fourth Gospel certainly included in *Memoirs* of, 72 *sq.*; recent investigations on, by Thoma, 73 *sq.*; Hilgenfeld, 75; Abbot, 75 *sq.*; Drummond, 76 *sq.*; Sanday, 78 *sq.*; Westcott, 80 *sq.*; consensus of opinion on, 81; his use of Fourth Gospel and belief in Apostolic origin, 81 *sq.*; why Fourth Gospel not more fully quoted in, 81 *sq.*; reasons suggested, 82 *sq.*; existing works of, fragments, 83; named by Tertullian, 90 *sq.*; his *Syntagma against all Heresies*, 91; and Valentinus, 92; and Marcion, 93; Bretschneider on, 182 *sq.*, 185; Strauss on, 208 *sq.*; Abbott on, 270; Martineau on, 288 *sq.*; 236, 260 *sq.*; 334, 348, 392

Justin the Gnostic, 364

Justinus Priscus, 53

Kaiser, 224

Keim, 5; quoted, 259 *sq.*, 279; on 'our age,' 3; on Justin and Fourth Gospel, 82; and Strauss, 205; views on the Fourth Gospel, 259 *sq.*; on Basilides, 371; on date of Polycarp's martyrdom, 390; 263, 320 *sq.*, 409

Kern, 192

Kerner, 192

Khayyath, 119

Kiel, 331 *sq.*

Kihn, 118

Klassen, 431

Kling, 282

Klopstock, 211

Klotz, ed. of *Stromateis*, quoted, 20, 21, 88, 100; *Protreptikos*, 22; 434

Klüpfel, 224

Körner, 178

Köstlin, his works, 235 *sq.* ; and Baur's theory, 241
Krabbe, 305
Krehl, 406
Krüger-Velthusen, 249
Kurtz, on date of martyrdom of Ignatius, 400

LABBÉ-MANSI, 118
Lachmann, 315, 358
Lacordaire, 14
Lactantius, 63
Ladd, quoted, 152, 156
Lagarde, De, on the Clementines, 83 *sq.* ; 315, 379 ; on the *Diatessaron*, 377, 386
La Motte Fouqué, 177
Lampe, 122, 428
Lancashire Independent College, 275, 284 *sq.*
Lang, 264
Lange, 184, 335
Laodicea, council of, 121, 151. See *Sagaris*
Lardner, 37
Lausanne, 335
Lazaro. See *Monastery*
Leathes, 335
Le Bas, 389
Lechler, his works, and views on the Fourth Gospel, 321, 322 *sq.* ; 331 ; quoted, 359
Lectures : I., 3-50 ; II., 51-104 ; III., 105-166 ; IV., 167-220 ; V., 221-296 ; VI., 297-354 ; VII., 355-413 ; VIII., 415-471
— Division of, 4, 5 ; subject of, 3
Leipzig, 179 *sq.*, 247, 322, 326, 331
Leontius of Byzantium, and Theodore of Mopsuestia, 118
Lessing, 211
Letronne, on date of Polycarp's martyrdom, 389 *sq.*
Levy, 440
Lewin, 432
Lewis, Sir G. Cornewall, opinion of, 7 ; quoted, 298, 352
Leyden, University of, 100
Lias, 335
Lichtenberger, 256, 301, 312
Liddon, on the Old Latin, 42 ; on the Peshito and Muratorian Fragment, 43 ; on Ewald, 251 ; 335
Lightfoot, Bishop, 14 *sq.*, 17, 45, 272, 283 ; quoted, 19, 29, 31, 34, 37, 41 *sq.*, 365, 375 *sq.*, 377 *sq.*, 381, 388, 391, 394 *sq.*, 396 *sq.*, 398 *sq.*, 400 *sq.*, 402, 404 *sq.* ; on the Muratorian Fragment, 45 ; on the first generation of the second century, 97 ; and Irenæus, 98 *sq.* ; and author of *Supernatural Religion*, 48 *sq.*, 267 *sq.*, 269 *sq.*, 350 ; his intense devotion to S. John and the Fourth Gospel, 163 *sq.* ; his last days, 164 *sq.* ; unnoticed by Bleek and Weiss, 342 ; his character as a witness, 337 *sq.* ; views on the Fourth Gospel, 343 *sq.*, 344 *sq.*, 345 ; value of his testimony, 351 *sq.* ; on the *Diatessaron*, 376 *sq.*, 379 ; on the date of Polycarp's martyrdom, 391 ; on Papias, 394 ; on the Ignatian Epistles, 395-402 ; convinced of their authenticity, 396 *sq.* ; Zahn on, 396 *sq.* ; *Edinburgh Review* on, 398 ; on Zahn, 398 ; Harnack on, 399 ; on the silence of Eusebius, 404 *sq.* ; 408, 452
Lipsius, 17, 19 ; quoted, 86, 90, 125 ; on Hippolytus, 364, 366 ; on Tatian, 376 *sq.* ; on the *Diatessaron*, 380 ; on date of Polycarp's martyrdom, 390 ; Lightfoot on, 396
Livy, 138
Lloyd, on date of martyrdom of Ignatius, 400
Logos, the, doctrine of, 68, 80, 124, 183, 259 *sq.*, 261 *sq.*, 265, 431, 436 *sq.*, 440 *sq.*, 442, 452, 461
Loman, 5 ; admits reception of Fourth Gospel at close of second century, 46
Lombard, Peter, 152
Lommatzsch, on the *Philosophumena*, 363
London, 270
Loofs, 257

Lotze, 240
Lucius Verus, 58
Lücke, quoted, 115, 247, 310; 235, 300, 439; on the Fourth Gospel, 311 *sq.*, 313; on the newer theories, 312
Ludwigsburg, 191, 201
Luke, S., *Gospel* of, quoted by Clement, 22; by Justin, 65, 71; Marcion and, 93; Gregory Nazianzen on, 116; 421
Luthardt, 263; views on the Fourth Gospel, 326 *sq.*; quoted, 424
Luther, views on the Scriptures, quoted, 153 *sq.*; he is to be the judge of what is and is not Scripture, 154; and the Reformation, 178; quoted by Meyer, 321
Lützelberger, and Strauss, 200
Lycaonia, 116
Lydia. See *Melito*
Lyons, 33, 69, 345. See *Church*

McClintock and Strong, *Cyclopædia*, 196
Mackay, 217
Mackintosh, Sir James, 10, 284; quoted, 11
McLellan, 335
Mallock, W. H., quoted, 12
Manchester, 266, 275, 454
Manchot, 100, 264
Mangold, views on the Fourth Gospel, 262; and Bleek, 314 *sq.*, 342
Mansel, 365; on Hippolytus, 366
Manuscripts, 5; Clermont, 35; Syriac, 35, 406 *sq.*; Chaldee, 118; Uncial, 120 *sq.*, 138; Colbertine, 373; Arabic, 385 *sq.*
Marburg, 326
Marcion, Tertullian and, 26 *sq.*, 91 *sq.*; Theophilus against, 27; a witness to Fourth Gospel, 83, 102; his date and position, 93; his gospel a mutilated S. Luke, 93; why he did not choose S. John, 93; Tertullian's testimony to, 93 *sq.*; Irenæus and, 94; estimate of his testimony, 95; Strauss on, 124, 209, 236, 264; Martineau on, 288
Marcus, and Valentinus, 85
Marcus Aurelius, 58, 389. See *Apolinaris*; *Athenagoras*; *Eusebius*
Marcus Pompeius. See *Justin Martyr*
Marheineke, 179
Mark, S., *Gospel* of, if quoted by Justin, 66; Gregory Nazianzen on, 116; 223, 421
Märklin, and Strauss, 191 *sq.*
Marquardt, on date of Polycarp's martyrdom, 390
Marsh, 172
Martin, 359
Martineau, James, 76; views on the Fourth Gospel, 286 *sq.*, 288 *sq.*, 411; quoted, 267, 286–291; on Justin, Clementines, Valentinus, Ptolemæus and Herakleon, Marcion, Apolinaris, Theophilus, 288; on Apocalypse, 289 *sq.*; on Paschal controversy and time, 290 *sq.*; on First Epistle, 291; summary of his views, 291 *sq.*; compared with Delff, 293 *sq.*
Martyrdom. See *Ignatius*; *Polycarp*
Masson, on date of Polycarp's martyrdom, 388
Massuet, 58
Matthew, S., *Gospel* of, quoted by Clement, 22; by Justin, 65 *sq.*, 71, 82; 12, 64; Gregory Nazianzen on, 116; 260, 357, 421 *sq.*
Matthew, the monk, Canon of, 121
Maulbronn, 192
Maurice, 315, 334
Maussul, 119
Max Müller, on faculty, 469 *sq.*
Mechitarist Fathers, 377, 381 *sq.*
Melito of Sardis, his date, 34; literary activity, 34; list of his works, in Eusebius, Anastatius of Sinai, Syriac fragments, 34 *sq.*; some genuine, others doubtful, 35; Westcott's opinion on the Apology of, 35;

contemporary of Apolinaris, 36; significance of his writings, 37; testimony to, by Polycrates, 38, 41; by Hippolytus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Anastatius, 38 *sq.*; recognized as an authority in Carthage, Ephesus, Rome, Alexandria, Monasteries of Sinai, 38 *sq.*; probably the Ionian named by Clement, 38; his connexion with the East, 38 *sq.*; his use of Justin, 69; 102; and Apology of Antoninus, 408

Memoirs. See *Justin Martyr*

Mêmrâ da-Yĕyâ, 440 *sq.*

Mendel. See *Neander*

Mental achromatism. See *Achromatism*

Merx, and Armenian version of Eusebius, 407 *sq.*

Metrophanes Critopulus, Canon of, 121

Meyer, on the Tübingen school, 246; quoted, 324, 343; views on the Fourth Gospel, 319; on negative criticism, 320 *sq.*; makes no use of Westcott and Godet, 342 *sq.*

Michaelis, quoted, 171 *sq.*

Mildert, Van, 131, 452

Mill, J. S., 14

Miller, 367; his edition of the *Philosophumena*, 360 *sq.*, 362

Milligan, 335

Miltiades, 91

Milton, 272

Minucius Felix, use of Justin, 69

Modern criticism. See *Criticism*

Möhler, 225; on date of martyrdom of Ignatius, 400

Möller, on Hippolytus, 366; quoted, 375

Mommsen, quoted, 425, 432 *sq.*

Monastery, of S. George, 118; of S. Lazaro, 382

Monoimus, 364

Monophysites, work of Anastatius against, 35

Montanism, and the Paraclete, 33, 444; Apolinaris and, 36; Strauss on, 210; 186, 264. See *Tertullian*

Montfaucon, 119 *sq.*

Moore, Aubrey, quoted, 459 *sq.*, 461

Mopsuestia. See *Theodore*

Morcos, and the *Diatessaron*, 386

More, Hannah, on the Bible, 177

Mösinger, and history of the *Diatessaron*, 382 *sq.*, 387

Moulton, 335

Müller, 300. See *Max Müller*

Mulhall, 446

Munich, 177

Muratorian Fragment, 42, 116; Liddon and Westcott on, 43 *sq.*; its date, 43 *sq.*; not settled, 44 *sq.*; Lightfoot and Von Döllinger on, 45; question of date will not affect evidence of, 46; its testimony to use of Fourth Gospel in third century, 108; and traditional origin of Fourth Gospel, 438 *sq.*

Murphy, 335

Murray, *Dictionary of English Language*, 463, 466

Mynas, his discoveries, 359 *sq.*, 364; quoted, 360

Myth, Strauss on, 196 *sq.*, 214 *sq.*, 216, 423; Bunsen on, 196; earlier and later theories of, 216 *sq.*; theory of, cannot live with Design, 218

NAASENI, the, 372 *sq.*, 429

Nablous, 53

Napoleon, 178, 445

Nathaniel, 411

Nazianzus. See *Gregory*

Neander, on inspiration, 160 *sq.*; 178, 197, 205, 229, 248, 300, 304; his change of name from Mendel, 305; special qualifications, 305; on the Fourth Gospel, 305 *sq.*, 307; and Lücke, 310; 315, 328

Negative criticism. See *Criticism*

Nepos, 110

Neubauer, 427

Neuchâtel, 328

Newcastle-on-Tyne, 454
Newman, Cardinal, on Tertullian, 22 *sq.* ; on inspiration, 158 *sq.* ; on discourses in S. John, 425
New Testament. See *Testament*
— — *Commentary.* See *Ellicott*
Nicene council, 121
Nicephorus Callistus, Canon of, 121
Nicephorus, Stichometry of, 121, 362
Nicodemus, gospel of, 186
Nicolaitans, 19
Niebuhr, 195, 315
Nisibis, Persian school of, 121
Nitzsch, 300
Noack, attributes Fourth Gospel to Judas Iscariot, 412
Noris, Cardinal, on date of Polycarp's martyrdom, 388
Norton, 63, 334
Novalis, 177
Nyssa. See *Gregory*

OCKHAM, William of, 152
Oehler, 17 ; ed. quoted, 23–28, 57, 63, 85, 87 *sq.*, 91 *sq.*, 94, 117, 122, 124 *sq.*, 378 *sq.* See *Tertullian*
Old Latin. See *Versions*
Old Testament. See *Testament*
Olshausen, 334
Oosterzee, Van, 335
Ophites, the. See *Naaseni*
Oratio ad Græcos. See *Tatian*
Orelli, and Strauss, 199
Origen, pupil of Clement, 20 ; 69, 149, 331, 407 ; his witness to Heracleon, 88 ; his date, 108 ; his division of the sacred writings, and full testimony to S. John and the Fourth Gospel, 109 ; commentaries on Fourth Gospel, 109 ; and Eusebius, 112 ; and Hilary, 122 ; and the *Philosophumena*, 360 *sq.*, 363 *sq.*
Otto, Von, 17 ; *Corpus*, quoted, 28, 29 *sq.*, 31 *sq.*, 33 *sq.*, 41, 53 *sq.*, 55 *sq.*, 59 *sq.*, 63, 65 *sq.*, 67, 69, 71 *sq.*, 77, 376 ; notes, 31, 32 ; on name Apolinaris, 34 ; on work by Apolinaris, 36 ; on Justin, 66, 71
Overbeck, 364
Oxford, University of, 12, 43, 152, 238, 250, 359, 445, 452
— House, 462

PAGI, on date of martyrdom of Ignatius, 400
Palestine, 20, 114, 187, 348, 426
— *Exploration Fund*, 358
Pantænus, 20
Papias, 97, 102, 343 ; Apolinaris, his successor, 36 ; his date, and testimony to the disciples of the Lord, 96 ; probably known to Irenæus, 96 ; his *Exposition*, 96 ; its title, 145 ; his use of the First Epistle of S. John, 96 ; witness to use of Fourth Gospel, 97 ; testimony of Irenæus to, 97 ; and Basilides, 100 ; in Eusebius, 'the living and abiding voice,' 145 ; Bretschneider on, 185 ; Strauss on, 206 *sq.* ; MSS. of, at Canterbury and Worcester, 357 ; newly discovered fragments of, support Johannine authorship, 394
Papirius, 41
Paraclete, the, 33, 124, 265, 439, 442, 444
Paris, 359, 361, 373
— University, 152, 256
Parsons, quoted, 176
Pascal, quoted, 2
Paschal Chronicle. See *Apolinaris*
Paschal controversy, 33 ; Strauss on, 212 ; Martineau on, 290
Paschal Cycle, 379
Pastor of Hermas, Von Döllinger on, 45
Patmos, 21, 394
Patriarchs, the Twelve, 185
Pattison, M., *Catena Aurea*, and Essays, 12 *sq.*
Paulus, 178, 204, 318 ; view of Fourth Gospel, 247
Pearson, 58 ; on date of Polycarp's martyrdom, 388 ; on date of martyrdom of Ignatius, 400

Peratici, the, 364 ; *Peratæ*, 373
Peripatetic. See *Justin Martyr*
Peshito. See *Versions*
Peter, *gospel of*, 40, 66
Petermann, 396
Petersburg, S., 406
Pfleiderer, 287
φησίν, meaning of, 368 *sq.*, 370 *sq.*, 372
Philaster of Brescia, his date, 122 ; a historian of heresies, 122 ; probably borrowed from Hippolytus, 122 ; quoted, 125
Philip of Hierapolis, 41
Philip of Side, 394
Philippi, 402
Phillips, 380
Philo, 68, 410 ; and Plato, 430 *sq.*, 441 ; and the Logos, 431 ; and S. John, 436, 457
Philosophumena, the, Strauss on, 209 ; Miller's edition of, 360 *sq.*, 362 ; importance of the discovery of, 364 ; views on, 365 *sq.* ; independent of views on Fourth Gospel, 367
Philostratus, 360
Photius of Constantinople, 39 ; reference to Apolinaris by, 36 ; quoted, 36 *sq.* ; Canon of, 121
Phrygia, 395. See *Apolinaris*
Pilate, Acts of, 185
Pitra, Cardinal, 35, 359, 385 *sq.*
Pius, Antoninus, 85
Plato, 60, 300, 338, 356 ; and Philo, 431, 441
Platonist. See *Justin Martyr*
Plummer, 335, 363, 402, 425
Plumptre, Dean, 135, 432
Poitiers. See *Hilary*
Polybius, 139
Polycarp of Smyrna, 41, 48, 97, 102 ; his martyrdom and probable date, 95 ; modern discoveries in relation to, 387–392 ; older view, 388 ; modern view, 389 *sq.* ; his personal link with S. John, 95 *sq.* ; his use of First Epistle of S. John, 96 ; his writings, 96 ; testimony of Irenæus to, 98 *sq.*, 391 ; Bretschneider on, 185 ; Strauss on, 211 ; 143, 269, 338, 343 ; his Epistle, if genuine, 402 *sq.* ; his Epistle, and Ignatian Epistles, 402 *sq.*, 404
Polycrates of Ephesus, testimony to Melito by, 38 ; his date, 41 ; letter to Victor of Rome, 41 ; his position and influence, 41 *sq.* ; accepts the Fourth Gospel as work of S. John, 42 ; describes S. John, 42 ; 102, 343
Ponticus. See *Serapion*
Pope, quoted, 13
Porphyry, 127
Portus, 263
Positive criticism. See *Criticism*
Postillæ, 151
Pothinus, 18
Potter, 86
Praxeas, Tertullian's reply to, 27
Prejudice, 6 ; anti-theological, 7 *sq.*
Pressensé, De, 335 ; on Ignatian Epistles, 399 ; 432
Prevorst, clairvoyante of, 192
Priestley, on Evanson, 176
Probabilia, the. See *Bretschneider*
Proculus, 91
Protreptikos. See *Clement of Alexandria*
Psalms, the, quoted by Justin, 66 ; by Polycarp, 143
Ptolemæus, and Valentinus, 85 ; his date and position, 87 *sq.* ; testimony to, by Irenæus, Epiphanius 87 *sq.* ; by Clement and Origen, 88 *sq.* ; by Hippolytus, 89 ; his *Epistle to Flora*, preserved by Epiphanius, 87 *sq.* ; edited by Hilgenfeld, 88 ; his system implies Fourth Gospel, 90 ; and Irenæus, 92 ; Strauss on, 210 ; Martineau on, 288
Pünjer, 303
Pythagorean. See *Justin Martyr*

QUADRATUS, 388 *sq.*

RAMSAY, 358
Randell, 389
Ranke, ed. of *Codex Fuldensis*, 379
Reading Church Congress, 80

Recognitions, the doubtful, 185
Reformation, the, 151; altered view of Scriptures at, 153 *sq.*; Luther and, 178
Renan, 5, 14; admits reception of Fourth Gospel at close of second century, 46; on Hippolytus and Basilides, 101; and Strauss, 195, 204 *sq.*, 212, 219; 251; quoted, 8, 9, 10, 29; views on the Fourth Gospel, 255 *sq.*, 411 *sq.*; on Basilides, 367, 371 *sq.*; on date of Polycarp's martyrdom, 390; 398, 409; on Fourth Gospel and Synoptics, 421 *sq.*, 423 *sq.*; on Ephesus, 427, 429, 432, 433 *sq.*
Resch, 143
Rettig, 247
Reuss, quoted, 109, 140, 254, 255; views on the Fourth Gospel, 253
Review, *North American*, 11; *Fortnightly*, 12, 13; in *Guardian*, 12; *The Academy*, 45; *Athenæum*, 285; *Nineteenth Century*, 76, 285, 446; *Church Quarterly*, 339; *Quarterly*, 340; *Contemporary*, 97, 330, 344 *sq.*, 377, 391, 404, 460; *Edinburgh*, 398
Réville, 264, 431
Reynolds, 335
Rhossus. See *Church*
Rich, the, collection. See *British Museum*
Richardson, 391, 400
Riehm, 333
Riggenbach, 335
Ritschl, 5; his works, 235; and Baur's theory, 242 *sq.*; on the *Philosophumena*, 364
Roberts. See *More*
Roberts, Alexander, on date of martyrdom of Ignatius, 400; 427
Romanticists, the, 177
Rome, 19, 33, 38, 43, 48, 61, 86, 108; and Tertullian, 23, 69 *sq.*; and Irenæus, 69; and Justin, 83; and Valentinus, 85; and Marcion, 93; and Hippolytus, 111; 186 *sq.*, 358 *sq.*, 374, 386 *sq.*, 395, 404, 430, 445 *sq.* See *Church*; *Victor*
Rönsch, 17
Roscelin, 152
Rosenmüller, 385
Rossi, De, 359
Routh, 41, 363; on date of martyrdom of Ignatius, 400
Rowan, quoted, 300 *sq.*
Rückert, 383
Rufinus of Aquileia, his date and relation to the Canon, 122; and Athanasius, 122
Ruinart, on date of martyrdom of Ignatius, 400

Sabatier, views on the Fourth Gospel, 256
Sagaris of Laodicea, 41
Salamia. See *Elias*
Salamis, 117
Salmon, 17; quoted, 37, 44, 131, 362; on the Alogi, 127; on *Supernatural Religion*, 269 *sq.*; character as a witness, 339 *sq.*; views on the Fourth Gospel, 346 *sq.*, 348; 392
Salzburg, University of, 382
Samaria, 395, 412
Sand, Ludwig, 307
Sanday, 17; quoted, 29, 41, 338; on Justin and Fourth Gospel, 78 *sq.*, 80; his opinion of Abbot and Drummond, 79; and Abbott, 80; on Lightfoot, 337 *sq.*; character as a witness, 341; views on the Fourth Gospel, 348 *sq.*, 349 *sq.*, 350; 268, 358
Sardis. See *Church*; *Melito*
Saxony, 179
Schaff, on Neander, 304, 335; 365, 402
Schaff-Herzog, *Encyclopedia*, 275, 285
Schanz, 336
Schebest. See *Strauss*
Schelling, 177; and Bretschneider, 190; and Strauss, 192 *sq.*; and Baur, 240
Schenkel, views on Fourth Gos-

pel, 248 *sq.* ; and De Wette, 308 ; 258, 260
Schiller, on date of Polycarp's martyrdom, 390
Schlegel, 177
Schleiermacher, 178, 179 ; Strauss and, 189, 192 *sq.*, 205, 211 *sq.* ; Bretschneider and, 190, 194 ; influence of Schelling and, 193 ; Baur and, 224, 252 ; his position and character, 299, 300 *sq.* ; his writings, 301 *sq.* ; treatment of New Testament, 302 ; and of the Apocalypse, 302 ; special views on the Fourth Gospel, 302 *sq.*, 304 ; and the Gospels, 302, 304 ; and De Wette, 307 ; and Lücke, 310 *sq.* ; and Bleek, 313
Schmid, on date of martyrdom of Ignatius, 400
Schmidt, 178
Schmieden, 223
Schneidewin. See *Duncker*
Scholten, 5 ; on Apolinaris, 37 ; admits reception of Fourth Gospel at close of second century, 46 ; on date of Basilides, 100 ; his position, 263 ; his views on the Fourth Gospel, 264 *sq.*, 266 ; and Martineau, 287, 291 ; on Hippolytus, 366 ; 335, 349, 409
Schulze, 184
Schürer, 17 ; on Davidson, 283 ; and the Fourth Gospel, 283 ; quoted, 263, 278, 382, 394, 399
Schwarz, 177, 193
Schwegler, 17 ; his works, 235 ; 236, 243, 373 *sq.*
Schweizer, Strauss on, 212 ; views on Fourth Gospel, 249
Science, 'laws or principles' of, 454 *sq.* ; not ultimate, 455 *sq.* ; and Fourth Gospel, 456 *sq.* ; no plea for its temporary expression, 458 *sq.* ; leaders of, dumb before origin of being, 459 *sq.* ; 'origination' and, 460 *sq.* ; modern ethical, 461 *sq.*
Scriptures, 24, 41, 113, 116 *sq.*, 118, 120, 123, 143 *sq.* ; tradition and interpretation of, 131 ; and the Church, 129 *sq.*, 131 *sq.* 134 *sq.*, 137, 141, 157 ; mechanical verbal inspiration of, 136, 157 ; not always accepted by Anglican communion, 157 *sq.* ; or Roman communion, 158 *sq.* ; or English Protestants, 159 *sq.* ; or foreign Protestants, 160 *sq.* ; New Testament not regarded as, 142 ; Moses and the Prophets regarded as, 141 ; first quoted by heretics, 146 *sq.* ; tradition one with, 148 *sq.* ; depend upon the Church, 149 ; Augustine on authority of, 150 ; Jerome on authority of, 150 ; how received in *Dark Ages* and until Reformation, 151 *sq.* ; altered view of, at Reformation, 152 *sq.*; Bodenstein's views on, 153 ; Luther's views on, 153 *sq.* ; Calvin's views on, 154 *sq.* ; Zwingli's views on, 155 ; and Council of Trent, 155 ; infallibility of, substituted for infallibility of the Church, 155 *sq.*; this infallibility attacked by modern criticism, 157
Scrivener, 358
Serapion of Antioch, his date, 39 ; his letter to Caricus and Ponticus, and testimony to Apolinaris, 39 ; his position and attention to the Canon, 40 ; testimony of Socrates to, 40
Sermon, on the Mount, 64, 422. See *Lecture*
Shaftesbury, 14
Sibylline Oracles, 185
Side. See *Philip*
Simon Magus, 364
Simpson, on Evanson, 176
Smith, Payne, Dean, 376 *sq.*
Smith, R. T., on date of martyrdom of Ignatius, 400
Smyrna, 432. See *Polycarp*
Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* quoted, 40 ; testimony to Apolinaris, Irenæus, Clement, Serapion, 40
Somerset, 176
Soulier, 431
Spencer, Herbert, quoted, 459, 463

Spiegel, 264
Stanley, Dean, quoted, 13 *sq.* ; 196, 315
Stap, his works, and view of the Fourth Gospel, 244 *sq.*
Steitz, 35, 227
Steudel, and Strauss, 193 *sq.*
Stoic. See *Justin Martyr*
Storr, 193, 224
Strack and Zöckler, 326
Strasburg, 253, 260, 262
Strauss, 5, 8 ; on Apolinaris, 37 ; quoted, 179, 198, 200–219, 231, 247 *sq.*, 252, 304 ; admits reception of Fourth Gospel at close of second century, 46 ; on the Clementines, 84 ; and Bretschneider, 189 ; and Schleiermacher, 189, 192 *sq.*, 211 ; home life, 191 ; at Blaubeuren and Tübingen, 191 *sq.*, 193 ; at Maulbronn and Berlin and return to Tübingen, 193 ; his contemporaries and surroundings, 192 *sq.* ; calm of 1834, succeeded by storm of 1835, 194 ; the *Leben Jesu*, 194–200 ; the replies, 194 *sq.* ; 'nothing new' in it, 195 ; critical methods, 195 *sq.* ; and the 'mythical theory,' 195 *sq.*, 214 *sq.*, 216 *sq.*, 218 *sq.*, 423 *sq.* ; and Steudel, 193 *sq.* ; and the Gospels, 195 *sq.*, 196, 213 *sq.*, 215 *sq.* ; bound by Hegelian *Left*, 196 ; and Ullmann, 197 ; and Baur, 192 *sq.*, 197 *sq.*, 200, 203, 205, 212 *sq.*, 214 *sq.*, 217 *sq.*, 219 *sq.*, 223 *sq.*, 225, 228, 230 *sq.*, 232, 234 ; his uncertainty, 197 *sq.* ; life between third and fourth editions, 198 *sq.* ; nomination to Zürich, and rejection, 199 ; fourth edition of *Leben Jesu*, and *Christliche Glaubenslehre*, 200 ; and Agnes Schebest, 201 ; describes his own fate, 201 ; in parliament, and political views, 201 *sq.* ; no theological work, 1840–64, other literary work of, 201 *sq.* ; the new *Leben Jesu*, 202–219 ; for whom written, 203 *sq.* ; and Renan, 204, 219 ; reviews earlier *Lives of Jesus*, 204 *sq.* ; on Papias and Eusebius, 206 *sq.*, 210 ; on the Ignatian Epistles, 208 ; on Justin Martyr, 208 *sq.* ; on the Clementines, 208, 210 ; on the *Philosophumena*, 209 ; on Basilides, Valentinus, Marcion, Tertullian, 209 ; on Irenæus, 209 *sq.*, 211 ; on Theophilus, Tatian, and Athenagoras, 210 ; on the Alogi, 211 ; on the Apocalypse, 211 *sq.* ; summary of views on Fourth Gospel, 212 *sq.* ; his critique that of Tübingen school, 213 ; conscious and unconscious fiction, 214 ; the Messianic idea, 215 *sq.* ; his disappointment, 217 ; on Ewald, 217 ; 236, 246 *sq.*, 267, 284, 300, 308 *sq.*, 318 *sq.*, 371, 409 ; on the Clementines, 375 ; on criticism, 411
Stromateis. See *Clement of Alexandria*
Stuttgart, 223
Sukrean. See *Arsenius*
Supernatural Religion, author of, 14 *sq.* ; review in *The Academy* by, 45 ; admits reception of Fourth Gospel at close of second century, 46 ; on the Gospels, 48 *sq.* ; his answer no answer, 49 ; on the Clementines, 84 ; his views on the Fourth Gospel, 267 *sq.* ; criticism of Zahn and Salmon on, 269 *sq.* ; on anonymity, 350 ; and the *Diatessaron*, 376 ; 375, 404
Supplicatio pro Christianis. See *Athenagoras*
Swabia, 191, 193
Sweden, 359
Swete, 119
Switzerland, 84
Sychem, 53
Sylburg, 86
Syria, 86
Syriac, fragments contain writings of Melito, 35 ; version of

Eusebius, 35; 108, 408. See *Cureton*

Tacitus, 138 *sq.*
Tanner, 131, 148
Tarphon, Rabbi. See *Justin Martyr*
Tatian, 57, 82, 102; as an apologist, 63; his *Discourse to Greeks*, 63; a compiler of four Gospels—the *Diatessaron*—63, 70 *sq.*; use of Justin, 69; the *Diatessaron* a key to *Memoirs* of Justin, 71, 387; Bretschneider on, 185; Strauss on, 210; Sanday on, 348; modern discovery of *Diatessaron*, 375–387; Armenian version of, 376 *sq.*; reference to, by Eusebius, 377, 379; and Epiphanius, 378 *sq.*; not known in Greek and Latin churches, but in Syrian, 379; probably written in Syriac, 379 *sq.*; older than the Curetonian, 384; Theodoret on, 380 *sq.*; commentary on, in Ephraim's works, 382 *sq.*; and Victor of Capua, 379, 383; 392
Tayler, views on the Fourth Gospel, 266 *sq.*; Martineau and, 285 *sq.*, 291
Taylor, Bayard, quoted, 457
Teller, 318
Tendency, Baur on, 197, 422 *sq.*
Tertullian, 68, 102; his date, position, and influence, 22; Cyprian on, 22; Jerome on, 22, 23; Cardinal Newman on, 22 *sq.*; Eusebius on, 23; his training, 23; native of Carthage, 23; connexion with Rome, 23, 69 *sq.*; his Montanism, 23 *sq.*; Tertullianists, 24; he quotes from the Fourth Gospel, 24; passages from his works, 24 *sq.*; *De Cultu Feminarum*, quoted, 23; *De Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, quoted, 25 *sq.*, 85, 92; *Adversus Marcion*, quoted, 26 *sq.*, 92, 94; *Adversus Praxean*, quoted, 27; *Adversus Valentinianos*, quoted, 91; *De Resurrectione Carnis*, quoted, 92; *De Carne Christi*, quoted, 94; use of *instrumentum* = *testamentum*, 26, 92; Strauss on, 209; 'Evangelical Instrument,' 26; his testimony to S. John, 25 *sq.*, 48; his testimony to Melito, 38; his use of the Old Latin, 42 *sq.*; use of the Gospels, 63, 68 *sq.*; his *Apology*, and *To the Gentiles*, 63; his references to the Gospels and Justin, 68 *sq.*, 70; identity of term *Gospels* with *Memoirs* of, Justin, 72 *sq.*; his unity with Justin, Irenæus, and others, 90 *sq.*; his treatment of, and position with regard to, the Valentinians, 91; contrasts Valentinus and Marcion, 91 *sq.*; and Heracleon, 92; and Marcion, 93 *sq.*; probably follows Irenæus in his treatment of Marcion and the Valentinians, 94; 139; Strauss on, 209
Testament, New, 4, 42, 44, 62, 63 *sq.*; demand for quotations in second century from, unreasonable, 64 *sq.*; 107 *sq.*, 109, 112 *sq.*, 114 *sq.*, 116 *sq.*, 119 *sq.*, 128, 133 *sq.*, 135, 138; no idea of writings for whole Church in, 140 *sq.*; terms used do not include idea of writing, 140; oral traditions and, 141; term 'Scripture' in, 142; not regarded as 'Scripture,' 142 *sq.*; little formal quotation from, in post-Apostolic age, 142 *sq.*; its Canonicity could not be until Catholicity of Church was, 146; the child of the Church, 148; 195, 206, 209, 211, 231, 245 *sq.*, 279, 282 *sq.*, 285, 301 *sq.*, 307, 319, 323, 333, 339, 342, 418, 422, 440, 442
— Old, 38, 62, 116, 119, 136, 138, 142, 143 *sq.*, 195 *sq.*, 215, 261, 265, 307, 319, 332 *sq.*, 380, 441
Testamentum. See *Tertullian*
Thenius, 335
Theodore of Mopsuestia, his date

and position, 117 *sq.* ; opinion of his opponent Leontius, 118 ; his treatment of the Canon, and reception of Fourth Gospel, 118 *sq.*

Theodoret, his reference to Apolinaris, 36, 39 ; on the *Diatessaron*, 380 *sq.*

Theodorus Balsamon of Antioch, list of, 121

Theodotus, 85, 92

Theologi, the, 427, 431 *sq.*

Theophilus of Antioch, 102 ; his date, 27 ; three books *To Autolycus*, 27*sq.* ; its date, 29 ; quoted, 29 *sq.*, 32 *sq.*, 416 ; compared with quotations from S. John, 30 *sq.*; *Against the Heresy of Hermogenes*, 27 ; other works, 27 *sq.* ; use of Rev. of S. John, 27 ; testimony of Eusebius to, 28 ; testimony of Jerome to, 28 ; his *Commentary on the Gospels* doubtful, 28 ; opinions of Zahn and Harnack on, 28 *sq.* ; his view of testimony, 29 ; his undoubted reference to Fourth Gospel, 29 *sq.*, 31 *sq.*, 405 ; and to S. John by name, 32 ; his use of Justin, 69 ; Strauss on, 210 *sq.* ; Bretschneider on, 185 *sq.* ; Martineau on, 288

Thiersch, 334

Thirlwall, Bishop, 301

Tholuck, Strauss on, 207 ; reply to De Wette, 308 ; views on the Fourth Gospel, 318 *sq.* ; 332

homa, on Justin and S. John, 73 *sq.* ; views on the Fourth Gospel, 261 *sq.*, 263

Thomas, S., 30

— Aquinas, 12, 152

Thrace. See *Ælius Publius*

Thucydides, 138 *sq.*, 338, 425

Tigris, 118

Tillemont, on date of martyrdom of Ignatius, 400

Tischendorf, 335, 358

Titus Flavius Clemens. See *Clement*

Tobler, his position and view of the Fourth Gospel, 249 *sq.* ; Martineau on, 287

Toynbee Hall, 462

Trajan, 100, 259, 279, 327

Translation, key to the Fourth Gospel, 426, 442 *sq.*, 447, 453 ; a problem for all time, 444 *sq.*; relation of Universities to problem of, 447 *sq.* ; its difficulties, 450 *sq.* ; only leaders can face it, 448, 450 *sq.*, 452 *sq.*

Tregelles, 358, 363, 438

Trendelenburg, 240

Trent, council of, 121 ; its date, and action regarding the Scriptures, 155, 158

Truth, 15 ; qualifications required to judge of, 7, 8 ; everything sacrificed to, 16. *Of Truth.* See *Bacon*

Trypho. See *Justin Martyr*

Tübingen, 126, 236, 322

— School, New, 211, 213, 219, 223, 234 *sq.*, 238, 245 *sq.*, 248, 250, 257 *sq.*, 327, 364, 371, 374 *sq.*, 398

— University, 192 *sq.*, 194, 224, 234, 336

Turrianus, 373

Tyndall, quoted, 459

Tyne, 162

Tyrannus, school of, 428

Ueberweg, on date of martyrdom of Ignatius, 400

Uhlhorn, 335 ; on Hippolytus, 366 ; on date of Polycarp's martyrdom, 390

Ullmann, 197

Ulrici, 240

Ulster, 275

Uncial manuscripts. See *Manuscripts*

Usher, on date of Polycarp's martyrdom, 388 ; 398 ; on date of martyrdom of Ignatius, 400

Valentinus, 245 ; school of, 19 ; witness of, to Fourth Gospel, 83, 102 ; his date, training, position, and disciples, 85 *sq.*, 87; his separation from the Church, and value as a witness, 85 *sq.* ; followers form two schools, 86 ;

in East, *Excerpta Theodoti* and *Doctrina Orientalis*, 86; in West, Ptolemæus and Heracleon, 87 *sq.*; their use of Fourth Gospel, 88 *sq.*; and Hippolytus, 89; his system implies Fourth Gospel, and so does the school, 90; testimony of Irenæus, Justin and Tertullian to, 90 *sq.*, 92; conclusion as to his use of Fourth Gospel, 92 *sq.*; Bretschneider on, 185 *sq.*; Strauss on, 209 *sq.*; Martineau on, 288
Valesius, 388
Vane, Sir Henry, 10 *sq.*
Vater, 195, 307
Vatican, 158, 374, 385 *sq.*, 386
Venables, 28
Venice, 377, 382, 407
Versions, Old Latin and Peshito Syriac, 42; Liddon and Westcott on, 42 *sq.*; their dates, 42 *sq.*, 108, 138; force of evidence if early date established, 44; verdict to be awaited, 45; question of date will not affect evidence, 46; their testimony to use of Fourth Gospel, 108; not all New Testament included, but certainly Fourth Gospel, 108; of the Syrian Church, 120 *sq.*; LXX, 143; Syriac, of Eusebius, 406 *sq.*; Armenian, of Eusebius, 407 *sq.*
Victor of Capua, 379, 383
Victor of Rome, 41
Victoria, Queen, 445
Vienne, 345
Villemain, his search expedition, 359 *sq.*
Vischer, 289
Volkmar, admits reception of Fourth Gospel at close of second century, 46; rejects evidence of Epiphanius about Tatian, 57; considers date of Justin does not affect result, 57, 59; on Messianic idea, 216; his works, 236; on Baur's theory, 240 *sq.*; Hilgenfeld on, 242; 210, 316, 320 *sq.*, 335, 349; on Hippolytus, 364, 366; on date of Polycarp's martyrdom, 390; on date of martyrdom of Ignatius, 400; on Clementines, 374; 409
Vossian Letters. See *Ignatian Epistles*

WACE, 235; on the *Diatessaron*, 382 *sq.*
Waddington, on date of Justin's First *Apology*, 58; on date of Polycarp's martyrdom, 389 *sq.*, 391
Ward, Humphry, 454
— Mrs. Humphry, *Robert Elsmere*, quoted, 6, 170; *New Reformation*, quoted, 76
Warfield, 359
Warington, quoted, 144
Wear, 164
Weimar, 308
Weinsberg, 192
Weismann, 454
Weiss, 319; his works, 323 *sq.*; views on the Fourth Gospel, 324 *sq.*, 326; notices no English writer, 342 *sq.*
Weisse, 5, 205, 212, 227, 258; his position, 247; views on the Fourth Gospel, 248
Weizsäcker, 17, 227, 287, 294; views on the Fourth Gospel, 257
Welcker, 216 *sq.*
Wendover, Mr. See *Ward, Mrs.*
Wendt, views on Fourth Gospel, 257 *sq.*
Westcott, Dr.,[1] 17; quoted, 32, 34, 109, 143, 441; on Melito, 35; on the Old Latin, 42; on the Peshito and Muratorian Fragment, 43 *sq.*; on Justin and Fourth Gospel, 80 *sq.*; on inspiration, 158
— Bishop, on Ewald, 251; 268, 337; on the Fourth Gospel, 345 *sq.*, character as a witness, 338

---

[1] Consecrated Bishop of Durham, May 1, 1890, and after that date referred to as Bishop Westcott.

sq. ; unnoticed by Bleek, Weiss, and Meyer, 342 *sq.* ; 358, 452
Westminster, 159
Westphalia, 139
Wette, De, 178, 194, 195, 197 *sq.*, 300 ; on Tübingen school, 245 *sq.* ; his life and liberal views, 307 *sq.* ; on the Fourth Gospel, 308 *sq.*, 310 ; Schenkel on, 308 ; on Lücke, 310 *sq.* ; on Bleek, 314
Whately, 14
White, 358
Wieseler, on date of Polycarp's martyrdom, 390 ; on date of martyrdom of Ignatius, 400
Wiesinger, 334
Wilberforce, 177
Williams, Monier, 446
Winer, 178
Witness, friendly and adverse, 13 *sq.* ; value of a, 350 *sq.* ; requisites in a, 351 *sq.*
Wolf, *Bibliothecæ Hebrææ*, quoted, 60 ; 195
Wood, 358, 389, 432 *sq.*
Worcester, Cathedral Library at. See *Papias*
Word of the Lord, 143 *sq.*, 145, 154
Wordsworth, Bishop, 334, 358 ; quoted, 143, 362, 380 ; on date of Polycarp's martyrdom, 390
Wright, on the *Diatessaron*, 380, 407 ; on Syriac version of Eusebius, 406 *sq.*, 408
Würtemberg, 193, 201, 223

XENOPHON, 138 *sq.*

YALE College, 335
York, school of, 152
Yorkshire, 176

ZAHN, 17, 359 ; on Theophilus' *Commentary*, 28 *sq.* ; quoted, 31, 60, 72, 87, 93, 145, 395, 402 ; on the Alogi, 123 *sq.* ; on *Supernatural Religion*, 269 ; his position, 330 *sq.* ; views on the Fourth Gospel, 331 *sq.*; on the *Diatessaron*, 379, 380, 383 *sq.*, 385 *sq.* ; on date of Polycarp's martyrdom, 390 ; on Lightfoot, 396 *sq.* ; Lightfoot on, 398 ; on date of martyrdom of Ignatius, 400
Zeller, 75 ; on the Alogi, 126 ; and Strauss, 193, 202, 207, 219 ; his works, 236 *sq.*; 227 *sq.*, 243, 318 ; on the Clementines, 374 *sq.*
Zimmermann, 190
Zöckler. See *Strack*
Zonaras, Canon of, 121
Zürich, 199, 218, 236, 249, 287, 317
Zwingli, views on the Scriptures, quoted, 155

PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
LONDON

RECENT WORKS.

THE SPEAKER'S COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY BIBLE, Explanatory and Critical. With a Revision of the Translation. By CLERGY OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCH. Medium 8vo.

THE OLD TESTAMENT. 6 vols. £6. 15*s*.
THE NEW TESTAMENT. 4 vols. £4. 14*s*.

THE APOCRYPHA: an Explanatory and Critical Commentary. By CLERGY OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCH. 2 vols. Medium 8vo. 50*s*. *Uniform with the 'Speaker's Commentary.'*

THE COLLECTS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, together with certain Psalms and Hymns appropriate to the Principal Festivals, rendered into Latin Verse. By C. WORDSWORTH, D.D., Bishop of St. Andrews. Crown 8vo. gilt edges, 5*s*.

THE FOUNDATIONS OF THE CREED: being a Discussion of the grounds upon which the Articles of the Apostles' Creed may be held by earnest and thoughtful minds in the Nineteenth Century. By HARVEY GOODWIN, D.D., Lord Bishop of Carlisle. 8vo. 14*s*.

LUX MUNDI: a Series of Studies in the Religion of the Incarnation. By VARIOUS WRITERS. Edited by Rev. CHARLES GORE, M.A., Principal of Pusey House, and Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford. 8vo. 14*s*.

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS:

Canon H. S. HOLLAND, M.A.
Rev. AUBREY MOORE, M.A.
Rev. J. R. ILLINGWORTH, M.A.
Rev. E. S. TALBOT, D.D.
Rev. R. C. MOBERLY, M.A.
Rev. and Hon. ARTHUR LYTTELTON, M.A.
Rev. W. LOCK, M.A.
Canon F. PAGET, D.D.
Rev. W. J. R. CAMPION, M.A.
Rev. R. L. OTTLEY, M.A.

THE MINISTER OF BAPTISM: a History of Church Opinion from the time of the Apostles. Especially with reference to Heretical and Lay Administration. By Rev. WARWICK ELWIN, M.A. 8vo. 12*s*.

THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH. By GEORGE SALMON, D.D., Provost of Trinity College, Dublin. 8vo. 12*s*.

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By GEORGE SALMON, D.D. *Fourth Edition.* Crown 8vo. 9*s*.

THREE COUNSELS OF THE DIVINE MASTER FOR THE CONDUCT OF THE SPIRITUAL LIFE. By Dean GOULBURN, D.D. *Cheaper Edition.* Crown 8vo.

OCCASIONAL THOUGHTS OF AN ASTRONOMER ON NATURE AND REVELATION. By Rev. CHARLES PRITCHARD, D.D. Crown 8vo. 7*s*. 6*d*.

[*Continued.*

THE WITNESS OF THE PSALMS TO CHRIST AND CHRISTIANITY. By W. ALEXANDER, D.D., Lord Bishop of Derry and Raphoe. *Third Edition, Revised.* Crown 8vo. 9*s.*

A CHURCH DICTIONARY: a Practical Manual of Reference for Clergymen and Laymen. By the late Dean HOOK. *Fourteenth Edition, thoroughly Revised.* One Volume. (790 pp.) Medium 8vo. 21*s.*

LIVES OF TWELVE GOOD MEN. By the late Dean BURGON, B.D. *Fifth Edition.* 2 vols. 8vo. 24*s.*

BUDDHISM: its Connection with Brahmanism and Hinduism, and its Contrast with Christianity. By Sir MONIER WILLIAMS. *Second Edition.* With Index and Illustrations. 8vo. 21*s.*

THE STUDENT'S EDITION OF THE 'SPEAKER'S COMMENTARY OF THE BIBLE.' Edited by JOHN M. FULLER, M.A., Professor of Ecclesiastical History, King's College, London. 6 vols. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.* each.

I. GENESIS—DEUTERONOMY.
II. JOSHUA—ESTHER.
III. JOB—ECCLESIASTES.
IV. ISAIAH—MALACHI.
V. GOSPELS—ACTS.
VI. EPISTLES—REVELATION.

DR. WM. SMITH'S DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE: its Antiquities, Biography, Geography, and Natural History. Illustrations. 3 vols. Medium 8vo. £5. 5*s.*

DR. WM. SMITH'S DICTIONARY OF CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITIES. The History, Institutions, and Antiquities of the Christian Church. Illustrations. 2 vols. Medium 8vo. £3. 13*s.* 6*d.*

DR. WM. SMITH'S DICTIONARY OF CHRISTIAN BIOGRAPHY, LITERATURE, SECTS, AND DOCTRINES. 4 vols. Medium 8vo. £6. 16*s.* 6*d.*

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN. With Notes and Dissertations. By B. F. WESTCOTT, D.D., Bishop of Durham. Medium 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

ACADEMICAL ADDRESSES. By JOHN IGNATIUS DÖLLINGER, D.D., late Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Munich. Translated, with the sanction of the Author, by MARGARET WARRE. With Portrait. 8vo. [*In October.*

CONTENTS:

Significance of Dynasties in History.
House of Wittelsbach.
Relation of the City of Rome to Germany in the Middle Ages.
Dante, as a Prophet.
The Struggle of Germany and the Papacy under Ludwig the Bavarian.
Aventin and his Times.
The Influence of Greek upon the Western World in the Middle Ages.
The Eastern Question in its Beginnings.
Jews in Europe.
Political and Intellectual Development of Spain.
Policy of Louis XIV.
The most Influential Woman in French History.

JOHN MURRAY, Albemarle Street.

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01148 7396